University of Alberta

The Device of the Double in Mikhail Bulgakov's Short Narratives

by

Irene Victorinovna Fardin

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts

in

Slavic Languages and Literatures

Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies

Germanic, Romance, Slavic

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 2002

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Acquisitions et services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-81304-5

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Irene Victorinovna Fardin

Title of Thesis: The Device of the Double in Mikhail Bulgakov's Short Narratives

Degree: Master of Arts

Year this Degree Granted: 2002

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herein before provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

I. Fardin

RR 1, Box 10, Legal
Alberta, T0G 1L0

25 Sept. 2002

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "The Device of the Double in Mikhail Bulgakov's Short Narratives" submitted by Irene Victorinovna Fardin in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Slavic Languages and Literatures.

E. Siemens

U. Margolin

P. Rolland

Sept. 17, 2002

Abstract

The device of the double is a common technical device in literature. This device is well suited to the short story and novella genres. Mikhail Bulgakov uses this device very frequently in his short narratives. Thus, the aim of the present study is to investigate how the device of the double influences other elements of Bulgakov's short narratives. The first such element is characterization which is, traditionally, served by the creation of a *doppelganger* or character double. As a result of doubling, the repetition of character traits occurs which contributes to the creation of the image of a character. The device of the double strengthens the characterizing capacity of point of view. It also serves as an indicator of the secondary themes in short narratives and contributes to the elaboration of the main themes in Bulgakov's works. In his frame-stories, this device is used for establishing a bridge between the framing and inner narratives.

To the memory of my uncle, Boris Volkov, who burned alive in his tank in the first ten minutes of his first battle on January 13,1945, when the Red Army was liberating Poland. He was twenty.

Поклон тебе земной, мальчик.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Dr. Elena Siemens, Dr. Uri Margolin, and Dr. Peter Rolland for their help and delicate guidance during the time of writing this thesis.

I am also grateful to my first, and the best, instructor in Canada, Sandy Gunderson, without whose support this thesis would never have been written.

I would like to say thank you to Barbra Churchill for her help in proofreading and her numerous suggestions.

I also send a deep bow to my first mentor at Ulyanovsk Pedagogical University, Doctor Maia Pavlovna Cherednikova, whose dedication to her pupils makes her an outstanding person.

Finally, I say thank you to my best friend, professor Mikhail Gershonovich Matlin, for his help in every stage of my studies and for that enormous influence that he has exerted on my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....1

A. THE DOUBLE IN LIFE.....2

B. THE DOUBLE IN LITERATURE.....3

C. THE CONCEPT OF THE DOUBLE IN LITERARY CRITICISM.....7

D. THE DEVICE OF THE DOUBLE AS A METAPHORICAL PHENOMENON.....14

E. BULGAKOV'S SHORT NARRATIVES 17

F. CONCLUSION.....19

CHAPTER 1: THE DEVICE OF THE DOUBLE AS A MEANS OF CHARACTERIZATION.....22

CHAPTER 2: THE DEVICE OF THE DOUBLE AND POINT OF VIEW 41

CHAPTER 3: THE DEVICE OF THE DOUBLE AND THE SCOPE OF THE WORLD IN THE SHORT STORY AND NOVELLA.....51

CHAPTER 4: THE DEVICE OF THE DOUBLE AND THE THEME OF A SHORT NARRATIVE.....61

CHAPTER 5: THE DEVICE OF THE DOUBLE IN THE FRAME-STORY.....75

CONCLUSION 90

WORKS CITED 93

WORKS CONSULTED 101

Introduction

The life and work of the prominent Russian writer and playwright Mikhail Bulgakov (1891 – 1940) attracts readers and critics in Russia to such an extent that, for example, the result of a survey revealed the interesting fact that his novel The Master and Margarita was the most popular book among young people in contemporary Russia (Кедров 3). Most of Bulgakov's works were not published during his lifetime, but after the publication of The Master and Margarita in 1967, twenty-seven years after his death, his other works, and an avalanche of critical studies on Bulgakov, began to appear. However, most critics, such as Edward Ericson, and George Krugovoy, concentrate on Bulgakov's ideas and beliefs, whereas the full-length studies on Bulgakov's life and work, by Marietta Chudakova, Ellendea Proffer, Lesley Milne, and Anthony Colin Wright, have used a biographical approach. Valuable in itself, this approach now is no longer beneficial because of its initial limitedness, and critics' interest should be directed to the study of Bulgakov's poetics, for his unique use of technical devices demands more intense critical attention. In fact, most critical works on Bulgakov are devoted to his *magnum opus*, his 'sunset novel,' The Master and Margarita." However, the brilliance manifested by the handling of themes, plot, and other elements in this novel was not achieved by Bulgakov all at once, for he mastered his techniques while his works grew in stature. Thus, it will be useful to explore some of the techniques which he developed in his short stories and novellas.

One such technique, the use of the device of the double, is present in many of his

short narratives. Although the device of the double is viewed by critics exclusively as a means of characterization, in the present study, I shall investigate how this device becomes an important element not only in characterization, but also influences other properties of Bulgakov's short narratives, such as genre, theme, structure, or works in tandem with such important element as point of view. The device of the double is one of the many that constitute Bulgakov's poetics and which have not yet been fully explored, ever though they are one of the main reasons for the popularity of his work.

A. The double in life

The phenomenon of the double does not exist in reality but is a pure product of the human imagination. If two people look, or feel, or act alike, in the natural world, they do so merely by coincidence, and only the human imagination gives to this phenomenon special, often conspicuous, significance. In many cultures, the birth of twins has been perceived as a sign of disaster, and a person's sighting of himself has been interpreted as a sign of his approaching death (Rogers 8). The notion of the double has associations with the uncanny and, possibly, the fear of the double is based on a person's inability to see himself completely. Thus, when a person sees himself in full, this experience is given a supernatural explanation. A person's reflection in a mirror or in water, or a portrait, unusually identical to the original, are connected in the human mind with the concept of the double and the uncanny (Rogers 8). Such perspectives create ambiguity, which Umberto Eco believes is "characteristic of the aesthetic message" (qtd. in Schumm 15), because these perspectives reveal the unexpected identities of people and objects.

B. The double in literature

In literature and oral art, the phenomenon of the double has a twofold implication. It is a motif which in some works turns into a main theme, and it is also a technical device used by authors in order to achieve desired effects, most often in characterization, but also in any other element of the work. Take, for example, the first extended epic, Gilgamesh (ca.2500 – 1300 BC), which includes a pair of counterparts: Gilgamesh, King of Uruk, and his brother and friend, Enkidu. This epic's main theme and plot are built upon the relationship between the two heroes and their different and similar traits. Gilgamesh meets a wild man, Enkidu; they become friends and love each other as brothers. They have many affinities: for example, they are both half human and half god, and both are brave and exceptional warriors. At the same time, they are also very different in many ways: Gilgamesh is a civilized man but wild in his deeds, and Enkidu, although he initially lives like an animal, is sensible and sober. Thus, the basic features of the literary phenomenon of the double were already established in antiquity: two characters share some specific characteristics but also possesses some contrasting features. Since then, the motif of the double has appeared sporadically in oral art and literature, and has never vanished.

For example, Virgil, in the Aeneid, from the first century BC, provides a complementary opposite character to the protagonist, Aeneas. The queen of Carthage, Dido, is a perfect ruler of her people, and is as strong and attractive as Aeneas, but she is his opposite in that she is a woman and also in that she prefers love to her duty as a leader of her people. As a result of this preference, Dido dies, but Aeneas successfully continues to perform the task that the gods have imposed on him. In the Middle Ages, Dante used

this device of doubling of the character when he portrayed Virgil as his guide to the journey in the underworld. The presence of Virgil as Dante's counterpart in the Divine Comedy (1301-1321) creates a sense of continuity through the ages because two poets, Virgil and Dante, people of different times and different beliefs, are united during this journey. They have some aspects of the doubles mainly because they are both poets. Shakespeare, as well, uses doubles in two of his comedies, Comedy of Errors (1594), and Twelfth Night (1600), which include the motif of mistaken identity. He creates twin brothers and sisters to explore the question of identity.

However, the most significant interest in the double emerged during the Romantic Movement: "Because the Romantic Movement made the inner life of man – spontaneity of feeling, imagination, spiritual exploration – fashionable if not respectable, nineteenth century audiences generally accepted works which revealed the two opposing selves within the human personality" (Rosenfield 313). It is during the Romantic era that the classic stories using the motif of the double were written. Most of these investigate the instability within a single man, and his division into two personalities: "The Romantic hero . . . is a potentially divided self; his identity is a conflict between his heroic essence and a more personal, more present existence" (Reed 63). The movement from the pre-Romantic period to the Romantic can be defined as a movement from the investigation of homogeneous figures to heterogeneous ones. In these stories, the double is portrayed as a person's shadow, as in Adelbert von Chamisso's "The Marvelous History of the Shadowless Man"(1814); as an automaton, as in Hoffmann's "Die Automate"(1819), and as a portrait in Oscar Wilde's The Picture of Dorian Gray (1891). The figure of the double

reached its maturity in the work of Hoffmann (Herdman 21), whom Gogol admired (Driessen 213), and we can assume that Gogol created many of his fantastic elements, particularly the double in "Нос" (1836), under Hoffmann's influence (Passage150).

In the post-Romantic age, interest in the motif of the double declined because of the rise of "scientific" psychology, which required the writer to abstain from moral judgment of his double heroes in order to "remain intellectually respectable" (Herdman 20). Chekhov did so in his short story "Черный монах" (1894), in which he portrays the clinical origin of a divided personality.

In Russian literature and folklore, the motif of the double as a second self did not exist until the nineteenth century when this motif emerged under the Western influence of Romanticism. I believe that the double did not appear earlier in Russia because of the different concepts of the self in the Catholic and Orthodox Christian religions. The Catholic idea of the self was heavily influenced by Gnostic doctrine, a system of belief, from many different sects, that emerged in the first century AD on the fringes of Christianity. In Gnostic thought, the problem of human duality is one of the most important issues (Herdman 7). In the third century, "the Gnostic tendency had a fresh resurgence in the form of Manichaeism, a syncretic Gnostic dualism . . . based on a belief in primeval conflict between light and darkness" (Herdman 7). Augustine was a Manichee before his conversion to Christianity. It is possible that his experience with Manichaeism resulted in his strong belief in the presence of duality in every man because he found it in himself and wrote about it in his Confessions (fifth century AD): "My inner self was a house divided against itself" (qtd. in Herdman 7). Augustine's thought influenced the

writing of Calvin and other Reformers. Reformism, in its turn, influenced all of Catholic Christianity. In contrast, this influence did not affect the world of Orthodox Christianity and, consequently, the idea of the dual nature of the human soul was not essential for Russian folk art and Russian Medieval literature. In the Western Russian provinces, the folk tales about "двоедушники," (people who have two souls) are obvious echoes of Ukranian and Polish folktales that emerged in two predominantly Catholic countries (Левкиевская 28). Only in the nineteenth century in the works of a few Russian writers – Gogol, Perovskij-"Pogorelsky," and Dostoevsky – does the figure of the double occur. Charles Passage believes that Western Romanticism, particularly Hoffman, influenced these writers, whom he calls "the Russian Hoffmanists" (15).

The doubling of a character as an artistic device, rather than as a figure of the second self, was more popular in Russian folk art and literature. The two brothers, Фома and Ерема, are popular characters in many Russian satirical folk tales. Each one of them possesses what the other one lacks. Фома never finishes his work and therefore has a nickname, Недодел. Ерема, in contrast with his brother, does his job with such an effort that he ruins it. His nickname is Передел (Сказки 280). The first Russian novel in verse, Pushkin's Евгений Онегин (1823-31) includes two sisters, Olga and Tatiana. They are complete opposites, despite their common upbringing, and each has qualities which the other lacks. In the same novel, the protagonist, Eugene Onegin, has his counterpart, Vladimir Lensky, whom Onegin sees as a version of his younger self, with feelings and ideas which he had in his youth, and has since lost.

Most of the major nineteenth-century Russian writers used the doubling of a

character as a subtype of the device of the double. Mikhail Lermontov, in the story Княжна Мэри, which is included in the novel Герой нашего времени(1840), gives to the protagonist, Grigoriy Pechorin, his counterpart, Doctor Verner, who, as both characters recognize, has all of the protagonist's traits. The main female character, Princess Mary, also has a double, Pechorin's beloved Vera. They are both capable of sincere feelings, but both are products of high society, which makes them behave under certain, often hypocritical, rules. Turgenev, Goncharov, and Tolstoy were also fond of depicting characters in pairs.

Bulgakov, who wrote in the1920s and 1930s was a contemporary of Surrealism, which focused on the dual identity of objects (Arnason 283), and, at the same time, also continued the Russian and European literary traditions by using the device of the double. What was significant for Bulgakov was his ability to use different types of doubles, and to use them more frequently than other contemporary Russian writers. Most importantly, Bulgakov used this element not only for characterization, but also for structuring other elements of the works such as theme, plot, and for creating a point of view.

C. The concept of the double in literary criticism

Most critics complain that the concept of the double has not yet been defined as precisely as it should be, and Albert Guerard's belief, that "the word *double* is embarrassingly vague, as used in literary criticism"(3), is commonly expressed in critical works on the subject of the double, for example, in the works of Nicole Bravo and Carl Keppler, among others.

Two problems complicate the possibility of clearly defining the term. First, its literary implication has not yet been fully separated from its psychological one, as the works of Otto Rank and Robert Rogers demonstrate. In real life, people who experience autoscopia, or split personality are often said to have a double in the form of "second self" or an *alter ego* (Rogers 14). However, Guerard points out that "autoscopic hallucination . . . is perhaps commoner in literature than in life"(5). He makes his statement based on Freud's belief that literature is a "much more fertile province" for the uncanny than real life (qtd. in Guerard 5).

In contrast to autoscopic hallucination, the psychological phenomenon of the multiple personality frequently occurs (Rogers 15), but does not often appear in literature, perhaps because the very admittance of this phenomenon's clinical nature automatically annihilates the double's ambiguity, which is a necessary property of the double. Ambiguity generates suspense and stimulates the reader's desire to penetrate into the mind of a character. As Herdman points out, "The psychological power of the device of the double lies in its ambiguity, in the projection of the subject's subjectivity upon a being whose reality the structure of the novel or story obliges the reader to accept" (Herdman 14). Perhaps the phenomenon of split personality is so appealing to the authors of detective stories because the suspense in such works lies upon the criminal case. Usually, the suspect's split personality is revealed simultaneously with the resolving of the criminal case and is an element of a surprise, but not a suspense.

Thus, in an attempt to define the terms for the literary double, we have to separate the psychological phenomenon from the literary one, and to leave the investigation of the

relationship between them to psychologically oriented criticism. As a result of this separation, we can concentrate on the term's literary implications.

The critic's second concern is the problem of which characters can be considered as doubles and which characters are "the merely opposite (or congruent) characters who are bound to crop up in the works of even the most naturalistic novelists, since all characterization involves an element of dialectic" (Herdman 15). No agreement exists about what features consistently indicate the double. Guerard, who was the first to complain about the vagueness of the term "double," is, strangely, the one who is ready to confirm the presence of a double on the basis of "a strong feeling of sympathetic identification" that one, or both, characters experience; on the reenacting by the minor character of "a major character's traumatic experience," and even on the basis of an occult connection between the two characters "in the author's imagination" (3). Thus, he offers the widest possible criteria for detecting doubles in literature.

Carl Keppler, in his meticulous monograph The Literature of the Second Self, attempts to narrow the concept of the double by calling the figure not "the double," but "the second self," and offers other criteria for detecting a double. Keppler thinks that "the second self is the intruder [who] always tends to remain half-shadowed, are always left in comparative obscurity" (3), and that the second self always does harm to the first, but that this harm "brings self-enlargement" to the original (195). However, the use of this criteria to analyze doubles gathers, in one group, characters that exist independently in the fictional world of a work, and those characters that, possibly, are only a result of the hero's imagination. For example, Keppler believes that Edgar Allan Poe's William Wilson

and his double are connected with each other in the same way that Dostoevsky's Raskolnikov is connected with Svidrigailov. However, William Wilson's second self is an ambiguous figure: the reader cannot definitely determine if he is a product of the hero's imagination or a real person. Poe obviously intends to not give a clear explanation of the second William Wilson's nature, and to leave it as a riddle for the reader. In contrast, Dostoevsky's Svidrigailov, although a very mysterious figure, is a real person who in no way is a product of Raskolnikov's imagination. Raskolnikov does have a connection to Svidrigailov, whom he intensely hates. Raskolnikov sees that Svidrigailov destroys people's lives and finds that he himself has become a destroyer of lives. The two characters' similar destructiveness connects them and highlights the most gruesome aspects of Raskolnikov's theory and deeds. However, they cannot have the same kind of connection with each other as does William Wilson and his double because Svidrigailov exists as an independent character.

There is no necessity to narrow the definition of the term "double," but it is necessary to define different types of the double. The confusion in terminology results from a lack of clear distinctions among terms that often are used interchangeably, but indicate different phenomena. In critical works on the double, critics use seven different terms: *the double, doppelgänger, second self, quasi-double, counterpart, character double,* and *complementary character.*

The term *doppelgänger*, invented by German writer Jean-Paul Richter, first appeared in his novel Siebenkäs (1796). It became the term used to designate "people who see themselves" (Richter 67). "Second self" designates an *alter ago* and came from

psychology (Reber 26). The terms "counterpart," "character double," and "complementary character" are essentially literary terms because they allude to characters, not to real people. Moreover, only the term "double" is used everywhere: in real life, in psychology, and in literary criticism.

Thus, instead of imposing one term on different types of doubles, as Keppler does, perhaps it is more beneficial to understand which terms are used interchangeably and which are not. The first and the most difficult task is to accept that the term "double" will always be used in indicating all these types of phenomena because the connotations of the word are so wide that it includes the meanings of all the other terms. Hence, the term "double" can be used to refer to a *doppelgänger* and to a counterpart as well. Thus, I disagree with Keppler and Bravo that this term's meaning is not narrow enough. Instead of rejecting the term, we can narrow its meaning by indicating to what particular kind of double we are referring.

Ralph Tymms, in his study Double in Literary Psychology, thinks that "Jean Paul's conception of the double is never profound, and sometimes it is quite trivial" (33), and criticizes the perceived limitations of the term *doppelgänger*. Nevertheless, many critics (Bravo, Herdman, Miller among others) use it in its very particular meaning to refer to a character that "is a second self, or *alter ego*, which appears as a distinct and separate being, but apprehensible by the physical senses (or at least *some* of them), but exists in a dependent relation to the original" (Herdman 14). According to this definition, Golyadkin Jr., in Dostoevsky's novella "The Double"(1846) is a *doppelgänger,* that is, Golyadkin Sr.'s second self, or *alter ego*. However, Leggatt, in Joseph Conrad's short story "The

Secret Sharer"(1912), and Svidrigailov, in Dostoevsky's novel Преступление и наказание (1866), are not *doppelgängers*, and consequently, not second selves for their originals, because they are "characters who exist in their own right, but reflect some internal aspect of another character in a strengthened form" (Frank 311). Joseph Frank calls such a character a "quasi-double," but it is also a "counterpart," and "character double," and "complementary character," and we can use these terms interchangeably. Thus, we have two groups of terms: one, under the main term *doppelgänger,* means the same as "second self" and *alter ego*, and also can be expressed as the "classic double;" and the other group of terms, under the main term "counterpart," means "character double," "quasi-double," and "complementary character." The terms that belong to the first group should not be confused with those in the second group, but the common term "the double" can be used to refer to any of them.

This classification enables us to decide which characters are doubles and to what group they belong, and to avoid Keppler's and Guerard's mistake of grouping together such different types of doubles as Ivan Karamazov and his Devil, and Ivan Karamazov and his brother Alyosha. The first pair consists of a character and his *doppelgänger*, his personal devil, or his second self; the second pair consists of a character and his counterpart, or complementary character, who embodies Ivan's potential to believe in God and with whom Ivan shares some features despite these characters' external differences.

In this study, I will use the term "double" for every phenomenon which can be referred to any term listed above, and will use another term when I want to point at the specific characteristic of the double. I also will use the expression "the device of the

double" when referring to any phenomenon that involves a classic *doppelgänger,* or counterpart, because this expression indicates broadly enough both phenomena.

In analyzing a double and its function in a work, it is most beneficial to approach it as a heterogenous phenomenon. In every work, a double has different characteristics, just as its original has his own individuality. Many critics try to limit the double to a few character types. For example, Keppler identifies seven types of doubles: the twin brother, the pursuer, the tempter, the vision of horror, the savior, the beloved, and the double in time. Robert Rogers, in his book The Double in Literature, believes that the double in literature is always a realization of the writer's hidden psychological anxiety. Claire Rosenfeld writes, in her essay "The Shadow within," that by presenting a double, the author always presents a hero's low, hidden, and dark second self. All of these statements are helpful, but they are all incorrect in the same way: they all limit a double to one single facet. However, a double might possess many of them at the same time. For example, Leggatt, in Conrad's "The Secret Sharer," is not only a savior, as Keppler states, but also reveals the Captain's hidden identity as someone who tolerates an outlaw. However, is it really an "evil" hidden identity? And is it only the hero's, and, consequently, Conrad's hidden identity? Leggatt can represent the hidden desire for not simply legal justice, but for human justice, which exists deep inside many people, and not in the author of the story alone.

Thus, when analyzing the figure of the double, it is most useful to characterize him without putting him into a rigid category. A double's general characteristics can be found only on the level of its function in a story. For example, a double can be objective, or

subjective, or raise the question of his objectivity. In Robert L. Stevenson's novella "Strange Case of Dr. Jekil and Mr. Hyde" (1885), Mister Hyde is an objective double because he is seen by many people. In Dostoevsky's "The Double," Golyadkin Junior is a subjective double who, we presume, is a product of Golyadkin Senior's disturbed mind, but the reader questions this double's subjectivity because Golyadkin Senior's co-workers also see Golyadkin Junior.

Furthermore, doubles can be also described as "functional" or "constant." A functional double exists briefly, usually for one scene in a story, and is used to reveal one particular character trait of the hero or the hero's feeling or state of mind. As Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, in her study Narrative Fiction, writes, "When two characters are presented in similar circumstances, the similarity or contrast between their behavior emphasizes traits characteristic of both" (70). In contrast to a functional double, a constant double exists for a long period of time in a story and is similar in almost every way to the original character.

D. The device of the double as a metaphorical phenomenon

According to Roman Jakobson's theory of the metaphorical and metonymical poles in language, all literature can be divided into two categories based on the predominance of metaphorical or metonymical elements in a work. The discrimination between these two poles is based upon two opposite processes essential for the use of any language: the selection among the different units of language and the combination of units into a coherent whole. For example, if a person utters the sentence "Поезд пришел по

расписанию," he has made a selection among the groups of words and picks up only those which most accurately express the information he wants to communicate. He has chosen "поезд" among the words designating the means of transportation, "пароход, автомобиль, самолет," or others. He also has chosen the form of the word: in this case, the verb is singular and nominative. Then after selecting the word and its form, he has connected it with the other words in the sentence. He did not use the word "прилетел," but "пришел" and only in the singular and masculine form. The grammatical rules of Russian demand this form. We select the units of language and connect them in accordance with the rules of the language we speak. Jakobson calls the process of selection "metaphoric" and the process of combination "metonymic" because "they find their most condensed expression in metaphor and metonymy respectively" (Jakobson 58). As David Lodge explains in The Modes Of Modern Writing, Jakobson applies this theory to literature and argues that in prose, the metonymical process prevails, while in poetry, the metaphorical, but they interact with each other. Jakobson's theory implies that "the formal rules of poetry (i.e., verse) – metre, rhyme, stanzaic form, etc. – are based upon relationships of similarity and cut across the logical progression of discourse" (88). In the works of realism, the metonymical elements predominate: "Following the path of contiguous relationships, the realist author metonymically digresses from the plot to the atmosphere and from the characters to the setting in space and time" (Jakobson 59). In Romantic and Symbolic works, the metaphorical process predominates because the aim of the authors in these movements is to depict the process of the subjective perception of the objective world, not a world by itself. The subjective processes occurring within the

human mind most often escape the rules of logic and divorce themselves from metonymical rules.

The device of the double belongs to the metaphorical category of devices because the double and the metaphor both "involve a quantitatively dual or doubling aspect" (Gordon 19). The two entities that constitute both a metaphor and a double are simultaneously the product of comparison and the reason for comparison. Between a character and his double, as between the two points of comparison in a metaphor, a hidden connection always exists manifesting itself in the repetition of similar traits, but leaving a gap in meaning that poses questions and demands investigation.

Explaining Jakobson's theory, Lodge writes: "The greater the distance between the tenor and the vehicle of the metaphor, the more powerful will be the semantic effect of the metaphor, but the greater, also, will be disturbance to . . . realistic illusion" (112). The differing distances between the tenor and the vehicle is reflected in my classification of the different types of doubles. With a classical *doppelgänger,* the existential distance between the character and his double is infinite because the double, in reality, does not exist. Therefore, it always evokes an aura of the uncanny. With a counterpart, the distance is shorter because the similarity between people is a rare, but natural, phenomenon. A counterpart can also evoke the uncanny, but as a result of its rareness, which, in turn, evokes fear and a sense of the supernatural. Consequently, the classic *doppelgänger* and the doubling of a character are most commonly found in the works of Magic Realism and Realism, respectively.

Magic realism is a distinctive blend of realistic and fantastic elements in the same

work. Though most fully realized in Gabriel Garcia Marquez's novel One Hundred Years of Solitude (1967), magic realism is a term that can apply to works of Nikolay Gogol in the early nineteenth century. Gogol created a fantastic world grounded in a realistic setting. In his short story "Шинель"(1842), the protagonist, the little clerk Akaky Akakievich, lives in the very real city of St.Petersburg, is working in a regular office, and is surrounded by everyday objects, but when he loses his beloved overcoat, he dies of grief and turns into a ghost who steals coats from wealthy people. In the novella "Нос"(1836), the protagonist loses his nose, which becomes a very independent and successful man, and for some time does not wish to return to its owner's face. In both works, the same strategy is used: Gogol presents realistically described characters who act naturally, in a down-to-earth, even naturalistic, setting, and includes a single fantastic event. In "Шинель ," the protagonist appears as a ghost, and in "Нос," the protagonist's nose disappears and turns into a man. The idea that lies underneath these described events is that life is not simple, and it is worth looking at it from a very unusual perspective.

Bulgakov became a follower of Gogol by creating the same kind of world. He admitted, in a letter to his friend and future biographer, Pavel Popov: "My favorite writer is Gogol; from my point of view there's no one to touch him" (qtd. in Чудакова 142). In Bulgakov's works, "as in Gogol, initial realism and social satire turn into fantasy and mingle with many irrelevant and absurd details" (Wright 51). This particular Gogolian tradition is most present in Bulgakov's short story "Diaboliada" and in the novel The Master and Margarita, but in each of his works, even in the most realistic, elements of magic manifest themselves.

E. Bulgakov's short narratives

Mikhail Bulgakov wrote his short stories, novellas, and *feuilletons* at the beginning of his literary career, and later abandoned this genre for dramaturgical works and novels. His short narratives can be considered the first step in his mastery of writing. Similarly, Anton Chekhov started his literary career by writing *feuilletons* and short stories and only later turned to plays. As well, Bulgakov and Chekhov were both initially medical doctors who wrote their *feuilletons* for journals and newspapers in order to earn extra income. Bulgakov admitted, "Творчество мое разделяется резко на две части: подлинное и вымученное" (Дневник 17), and the latter was a body of works that bring immediate money (Milne 21).

However, whereas Chekhov continued to write short stories throughout his life, resulting in "the formation of the Chekhov short story and of the Chekhovian narrative style as a distinct phenomena in Russian art of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries" (Chudakov 2), Bulgakov stopped writing short fictions after showing that he had mastered it in "Heart of a Dog" ("Собачье сердце") (1925), one of his last short narratives. Thus, unlike Chekhov, Bulgakov wrote a small number of short stories, and wrote them only during the earliest period of his literary career, or his period of "learning." Chekhov also went through a learning period, but critics usually focus on his later stories, in which he speaks as "unquestionably the finest Russian writer of his time" (Chudakov 362). Chekhov's work "underwent extensive evolution" (Chudakov 364) from his first short stories to his mature works, as did Bulgakov's. However, even during his period of "learning," Bulgakov's literary technique developed in a remarkable way. His

short narratives range from the fragmentary and inconsistent "Notes on the Cuffs" ("Записки на манжетах"), written in 1922, to such masterpieces as "Red Crown"("Красная корона") (1922) and "Heart of a Dog."

Probably, because of the limited number of Bulgakov's short narratives compared to the large number of *feuilletons* that he wrote in order to increase his income, many critics consider all of his short stories to be unsatisfactory. Anthony Colin Wright, for example, finds almost nothing positive, or even interesting, even in "Heart of a Dog." He writes in his monograph, Bulgakov: Life and Interpretation that Bulgakov "tends at this time give us stereotypes, with little development" (62). This, as we shall see, is not necessarily the case.

In general, the current criticism on Bulgakov is basically biographical with some scattered attempts to analyze his poetics (Milne, Proffer, Wright). Although these studies are interesting for what they reveal about Bulgakov, their critiques of his short stories usually consist of plot summaries and some remarks on the main characters. When the critics try to find a connection among the stories, they turn to common themes and Bulgakov's political attitude. If critics do turn to the study of Bulgakov's technique, they usually focus on the novel The Master and Margarita. Thus, I find it important to explore the device of the double which is used in Bulgakov's early, often underestimated and thus neglected, prose.

F. Conclusion

I chose for my investigation eight of Bulgakov's short stories and two novellas,

"Heart of a Dog"("Собачье сердце") (1925) and "Diaboliada" ("Дьяволиада") (1925). The choices are made based on the presence of the device of the double in these works. By using the expression "short narrative," I refer to both genres: the short story and the novella. In the situation when there is an analysis of one particular work, however, I will use that term which indicates the genre of the particular work more precisely; that is, "short story," or "novella."

I begin my investigation with an exploration of the traditional function of the double which is one of characterization. The main purpose for the double's creation is the author's intention to compare two or more characters, because when characters are presented in pairs, or the second self of the original appears, the reader is compelled to compare them, even if the author does not do it himself. This process of comparison contributes to characterization. Thus, in the first chapter of my thesis, I explore how the double works toward characterization in Bulgakov's short narratives.

Point of view is the mode by which the story is told and it works for characterization only indirectly. The device of the double reinforces the characterizing capacity of the point of view. In the second chapter, I explore the interaction of point of view and the device of the double in Bulgakov's novella "Heart of a Dog."

Short narratives require an economy of language from the author. Guerard observes that "the convention of the double" permits to the authors of short narratives "a rather extraordinary economy" (14). Thus, in the third chapter, I investigate how the device of the double makes possible a broader scope in Bulgakov's short stories and novellas without increasing the length of the works.

In the fourth chapter, I turn my attention to the other function of the device of the double, which is its capacity to transform the specific theme of a short narrative into one of the universal themes of humanity. This capacity is built upon the metaphorical nature of the device of the double when "the double becomes a metaphor for a person's relationship with the world"(Bravo 357).

In the final chapter, I explore how the creation of the double makes the framing narrative contribute significantly to the inner narratives in two of Bulgakov's frame-stories. I will argue that even functional doubles, when the double repeats only one trait of the original, play a considerable role in creation of story's main issues.

The device of the double as a means of characterization

Traditionally, the device of the double is viewed by critics as a means of characterization (Roger, Tymms, Coates among others). This view is highly justifiable because by initially creating a double or a counterpart, connected to the original, the character traits of the original can be highlighted. Thus, I begin my study by exploring the function of the device of the double in characterization in Bulgakov's short narratives. I argue that the creation of a double or a counterpart is a powerful tool for the repetition of character traits. For my analysis, I chose four of Bulgakov's short narratives, namely, "Heart of a Dog" ("Собачье сердце") (1925), "Fire of the Khans"("Ханский огонь") (1924), "Blizzard"("Вьюга") (1922), and "Morphine"("Морфий")(1922) because in these works the device of the double manifests itself explicitly as a means of characterization.

Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, in her basic monograph, Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics, writes that characterization is a process of "assembling various character-indicators distributed along the text-continuum [and] any element in the text may serve as an indicator of character" (59). Moreover, she points out that some elements are most frequently associated with characterization. She divides these particular character-indicators into two groups: direct definition, and indirect presentation. Direct definition is naming character qualities by the most authoritative voice in the text, usually, the omniscient narrator's voice. Indirect presentation displays character traits through action, speech, external appearance, and environment. However, all these character-

indicators become apparent only if the reader notices them and is able to draw some conclusions from them. The repetition of the character-indicators which points to the same character trait is one of the methods of emphasizing it. In regard to this, Mieke Bal in Narratology writes: "In the course of the narrative the relevant characteristics are repeated so often – in a different form, however – that they emerge more and more clearly. Repetition is thus an important principle of the construction of the image of the character" (85). A double and a counterpart is one of these forms in which the necessary characteristics emerge. The particularity of a double and counterpart as a means of repetition of character traits is that these traits are personified in another character, as in the case with a counterpart, or in the figure of a *doppelganger*. The character traits of the original character are repeated in his double's behavior.

In Bulgakov's novella, "Heart of a Dog," we can distinguish several pairs of counterparts. In this novella, a medical doctor, Professor Preobrazhensky, in 1925 Moscow, performs experiments in rejuvenation. He finds a hungry mongrel Sharik on the Moscow streets, fattens him up, and transplants into his body, for the sake of an experiment, the pituitary glands and testicles of an unemployed, alcoholic, and criminal man. Sharik, while living in luxury in the Professor's apartment, becomes everyone's beloved pet, but when he turns into a man, he becomes a drunkard and thief who tries to rape every woman he sees. As well, he denounces his own creator to the CheKa (the former name of the KGB) and finally threatens to shoot him. Finally, the Professor and his assistant perform a reverse operation that turns this dangerous man back into a dog. At the very end of the novella, the happy dog is peacefully living in the Professor's apartment

and, as he did at the beginning of the novella, perceives the Professor as a deity.

The first pair of counterparts is Professor Preobrazhensky and his young assistant, Doctor Bormental. They both are devoted to medical science, and are obsessed with medical experimentation. They are both single, and treat women with old-fashioned respect. They both are very honest and critical of their own actions. In general, they repeat almost every one of each other's characteristics. As is the case with most doubles, however, they are not completely identical. They are different in age and experience, which Bormental lacks, but which the Professor possesses in abundance. Bulgakov emphasizes their similarity by having Professor Preobrazhensky call Doctor Bormental, "будущий профессор Борменталь"(193).

During the operation, which results in the transformation of a dog into a man, Doctor Bormental acts and looks like Preobrazhensky. The writer depicts them both by using terms that are usually ascribed to wild beasts: "Борменталь набросился хищно"(155); the Professor "злобно заревел"(157), and "Борменталь с торзионным пинцетом, как тигр, бросился зажимать"(157). Bulgakov also describes them as "убийцы, которые спешат" (156). To ensure that the reader understands that Bormental possesses his teacher's surgical skills, Bulgakov uses the same comparisons to describe both doctors' skills. One of the comparisons refers to Doctor Bormental, and the other to Professor Preobrazhensky, but they are similar: "Инструмент мелькнул в руках у тяпнутого [Борменталя], как у фокусника,"(154) and : "Нож вскочил к нему [Преображенскому] в руки как бы сам собой" (156). Thus, by portraying the two characters as a pair, Bulgakov

provides a double characterization: when he shows how Professor Preobrazhensky acts or speaks, the reader can imagine how Doctor Bormental would act or speak in the same situation if he were of Preobrazhensky's age. The same happens with Preobrazhensky. The reader can see in Bormental what kind of person Preobrazhensky was when he was young. Providing a connection of counterparts between the two characters, Bulgakov repeats their character traits by reflecting them in both characters.

Ellendea Proffer, Lesley Milne, Colin Wright and all other critics without exception, while interpreting Preobrazhensky's character, point out his bold conservatism. They find that he stands for the old order of things and tries to maintain this order in the tiny, isolated world of his apartment despite the political turmoil that happens in Russia. I disagree with this interpretation. Preobrazhensky works on the foremost edge of medical science and believes in the progress that science provides. He is, therefore, more radical in his profession than conservative. Moreover, he is the first to recognize his own mistake in experimenting with Sharik: "Старый осел Преображенский нарвался на этой операции, как третьекурсник" (193). In other words, he is able to change his opinion if the facts of life do not support it. In the conversation with Doctor Bormental about the disastrous result of the experiment, he states, "Вот, доктор, что получается, когда исследователь вместо того, чтобы идти ощупью и параллельно с природой, форсирует вопрос и приподнимает завесу!" (193). Professor Preobrazhensky is conservative in his lifestyle, but he is radical in his work. He is devoted to those facts and events of life which provide positive evolutionary progress. Thus, Preobrazhensky is faithful to extreme to the number of principles he came to as a result of "опыта и

наблюдения." (143). Hence, not Preobrazhensky's conservatism but his extremism is total. Bulgakov points many times in the course of the novella that Doctor Bormental also possesses this extremism. When the experiment with Sharik promises to be a scientific breakthrough, "пламенный" Bormental sincerely believes that they can produce new Spinosas, but when the man Sharikov turns into a monster, Bormental starts to protect his worshiped mentor, and the women in the apartment, from Sharikov with the same extreme passion. This character trait of Bormental and Preobrazhensky leads them to perform the reverse operation on Sharikov, which is, in fact, a murder.

When Professor Preobrazhensky is alone, he speaks to himself about the reverse operation: "Ей-богу, я, кажется, решусь!" (187). However, speaking with Doctor Bormental, he strongly insists on not doing any harm to Sharikov: "На преступление не идите никогда, против кого бы оно ни было направлено. Доживите до старости с чистыми руками" (195). This hidden confrontation with two "selves" within Preobrazhensky's mind manifests itself explicitly in two different types of behavior: the first of Preobrazhensky himself, and the second of his counterpart Doctor Bormental. While the Professor desperately tries to get rid of Sharikov without killing him, his young colleague openly threatens to kill Sharikov: "Я сам, на свой риск, покормлю его мышьяком" (195). Finally, the Professor performs the operation not because he betrays his principles to which he was faithful all his life, but because Doctor Bormental starts suffocating Sharikov. The killing would take place regardless, and Professor Preobrazhensky takes the sin of the reverse operation up on himself, thus saving his pupil from becoming a real murderer. Thus, portraying two doctors as counterparts, Bulgakov

creates an extremely complex situation when the mentor passes to his favorite pupil a characteristic of going to extreme in any action. This character trait finally turns them both into murderers. Wright states that, "The main fault of the story ["Heart of a Dog"] is in the lack of characterization"(62), but it is difficult to agree with him when witnessing such a complex net of problems that are manifested through the main characters and their relationship. Preobrazhensky's tragedy emerges not only from the frustration which appears from his understanding that natural science is unable to improve human nature, but from the much more personal tragedy of having to face the change in himself: he thinks of destroying the creature he created, even though he understands that by doing so, he is destroying a man's life. Moreover, he sees how this extreme desire to annihilate Sharikov is embodied literally in his favorite pupil.

Although the initial operation that the professor performs is an unparalleled event, the man Sharikov, who emerges as a result of the operation is not unique. His doubles, who share his attitude toward life, exist everywhere, even in Kalabukhov's house where the Professor lives. Every night, a choir of communists sings revolutionary hymns in one of the apartments. Their leader, Shvonder, is the chair of the House Management Committee and Sharikov's double. He attempts to destroy the Professor's special status as a tenant of Kalabuchov's house. Bulgakov underlines Sharikov's and Shvonder's resemblance by giving them last names beginning with the letter "III" and a shock of thick hair. Sharikov and Shvonder are not psychological doubles. Moreover, they are very different almost in all of their characteristics and in their lifestyles, but they are halves of one complete character: what Sharikov lacks, Shvonder has in abundance, and vice versa.

Shvonder by himself cannot curtail Preobrazhensky's spacious living accommodations, but he does so by giving his counterpart, Sharikov, clear instructions and guiding him theoretically. Sharikov, in his turn, with his complete absence of morality, is an ideal tool for implementing Shvonder's communist theories. However, one character trait is repeated in both characters, and that is their aggressiveness. They both assume their right to make people do what they want them to do. Shvonder does it mostly theoretically, and Sharikov violently. The result of doubling Sharikov – Shvonder's aggressiveness is that they appear to be more sinister figures than if the repetition did not exist.

In "Heart of a Dog," one of the secondary characters is the typist Vasnetsova. She appears in the novella only in two episodes. First, she is a passer-by on the street when she pets the dog Sharik, and is the only one among all the people on the street who feels sorry for the sick and hungry mongrel. Second, she comes into the apartment of Professor Preobrazgensky as a fiancée of Sharikov, who by that time has become a human.

Although Vasnetsova appears only briefly in the novella, the author gives her a few important characteristics which help the reader perceive her as a coherent character. One of these characteristics is that she is a sufferer because of her financial situation and as a dependent on her boss, whose mistress she is. She cannot wear warm clothes because her boss has given her beautiful lingerie and insists that she wear it. She has medical problems with her lungs and stomach because of the inhumane conditions in which she lives. However, Bulgakov mentions that the poor typist's boss has a wife, Matryona, whose flannel underwear has made him tire of her. This unknown woman, who also depends on the same man, becomes a complementary character to the typist Vasnetsova. Bulgakov

creates this pair of counterparts by giving each of them only one part of a full name. The typist has only a last name; the boss' wife has only a first name. Two women – one a wife, the other a mistress – both depend on the same man who uses them. By providing a counterpart for the typist, Bulgakov achieves two goals. First, he typifies and generalizes the position of women in post-revolutionary Russia as dependent on men, and demonstrates that the revolution did not bring any improvement to the life of the average woman. Second, the very existence of another woman explains why Vasnetsova later agrees to marry Sharikov, who is a cruel and dangerous man. With a life consisting of a day-to-day struggle for survival, the girl hopes that being a wife can help her survive. She hopes for a life like Matryona's, but the reader, who sees them as counterparts, knows that Matryona also suffers from living a life of dependency. Thus, by giving Vasnetsova a counterpart, Bulgakov repeats these particular characteristics of the woman as a sufferer and a survivor, thereby making these characteristics more noticeable to the reader.

Bulgakov also creates another pair of female characters in "Heart of a Dog": Professor Preobrazhensky's servants, the cook Darya Petrovna and the maid Zina. Wright argues that, in "Heart of a Dog," "the servants are [. . .] shadowy figures"(60) and that Zina is "characterless"(60). He fails to notice, however, that both women are not typical servants and, to a degree, are unique in Russian literature due to the way in which Bulgakov portrays their relationship with their employer, Professor Preobrazhensky, and how they perceive their own position in his apartment. They are neither afraid of losing their jobs, nor of arguing with Preobrazhensky. Zina often reminds the Professor that Sharik should not be living in the apartment and her tone is very categorical: "Пса в

столовой прикармливаете, – раздался женский голос, – а потом его отсюда калачом не выманишь" (141). Her position is in contrast to that of Doctor Bormental who never disagrees with his mentor, although Bormental's livelihood does not depend on the Professor's decisions. Moreover, Darya Petrovna is also very independent and perceives the kitchen as her own kingdom. Sharik, with his particular sensitivity, immediately notices her independence: "Вся квартира не стоила и двух пядей Дарьиного царства" (151). Although these women have similar attitudes towards their jobs and employer, Bulgakov contrasts them in other ways: Zina is young, while Darya Petrovna is older; Zina is educated enough to assist the Professor with his operations, while Darya Petrovna is barely literate and has to print a note instead of writing it; Zina is elegant while Darya Petrovna has bad taste. She wears twenty-two false diamonds in her hair and gives Sharikov a vulgar tie. By emphasizing their differences, Bulgakov suggests that under "normal" conditions that is, before the revolution, people of different ages, educations, and habits were often happy in their roles as servants, and actually did not perceive themselves as servants, but as assistants. Bulgakov continues this theme of essential equality among people in his later works. In the novel, White Guard (1925), for example, the young servant Anuta is perceived by the members of Turbin's family to be a relative. In The Master and Margarita (1940), Margarita's housekeeper, Natasha, is also her best friend.

With these two female characters, Bulgakov continues Pushkin's tradition of depicting happy people who occupy traditionally "low" positions in society. The old servant Savelyich from Pushkin's Капитанская дочка (1836) who is happy to share

with his master, Grinyov, all the vicissitudes of fate and who, more often than not, commands his master, is perhaps the first example of a character in Russian literature whose happiness depends completely not on what job he is doing but on how he is doing it. The uniqueness of Pushkin's and Bulgakov's servants is that they are very content in spite of their position. However, in Pushkin's story, Savelyich is the only character of this type, whereas in Bulgakov's story, the phenomenon of a happy servant is not presented as an exception. As a result of character doubling, this phenomenon is presented as typical of life before the revolution because Zina's satisfaction with her job is emphasized by the same feeling that Darya Petrovna has. The repetition is achieved by creating two complementary characters.

Darya Petrovna, while preparing a meal, cuts off the heads and claws of a flock of grouse and looks like "беспощадный палач"(150). Most of the critics note the similarities between this scene and that of the operation in which both doctors look like "убийцы" (156) while cutting open the dog. Although Bulgakov deliberately creates such obvious similarities between these two scenes, no critic has provided a convincing explanation for it. The answer is that these two scenes provide an example of functional doubles created by the writer in order to emphasize one feature that the doctors and their cook have in common: their passion for their work, whether it is done in an operating room or in a kitchen. If we realize that the characters living in Preobrazhensky's apartment are happy because they are doing what they like to do, we can understand that their only concern is to produce high-quality work and that they perform their tasks without worrying about appearances.

As a result, they contrast with the members of the House Management Committee who force the tenants out of the apartment building where the professor lives, and who are sinister representatives of the Bolshevik regime. They are very concerned about their appearance and the impression they make on people. When they come to the Professor's apartment in order to take over part of it, they are all wearing leather jackets and look "очень скромно" (135). They obviously want to look very much alike in order to embody one of the communists' slogans about erasing differences among people. They rely on their identical uniforms to such an extent that they become ridiculous: the Professor cannot distinguish which one is a man and which one is a woman, and bluntly asks, "Вы мужчина или женщина?"(135). The same people organize a choir and sing revolutionary songs every evening in one of the apartments they confiscated. Singing a song is a theatrical performance, as is their emphasis on their appearance. For Preobrazgensky, a theatrical performance should take place only in a theater, and he proclaims his belief in the basic rule of a successful social structure: "Я сторонник разделения труда. В Большом пусть поют, а я буду оперировать" (146). In this respect, it is interesting to analyze the relationship between the protagonist, Professor Preobrazhensky, and the doorman Fyodor. Their relationship is characterized by a deep mutual respect and a striking understanding of each other, even though they belong to extreme opposite ends of the social ladder. They can be considered as counterparts because of their similar attitude to their job, as is the case with Professor Preobrazhensky and the cook Darya Petrovna. Fyodor looks after the apartment building with a passion not unlike Preobrazhensky's medical zeal, and the tenants of the house consider him to be

a part of their families. Fyodor shares with Preobrazhensky the same attitude toward the Revolution, and hates the Bolshevik House Committee as much as Preobrazhensky does. In the third chapter, in his main monologue about the Revolution, Preobrazhensky points out that during the days of the Revolution his shoes were stolen and a samovar was also stolen from Fyodor's room. In this passing comment, Bulgakov puts Professor Preobrazhensky and the doorman Fyodor into the same group of people who suffer from the Revolution, and their suffering does not depend on their social position, but is a result of the horror brought about by the Revolution.

The similarities between the two men were noticed by the creators of the film adaptation of the novella "Собачье сердце"(dir.В. Бортко, 1988). They included an episode, which does not exist in the Bulgakov's novella, but which contributes to Fyodor's characterization. In this episode Fyodor washes the floor and the stairs and listens how the members of the House Committee in the apartment next door educate Sharikov about the social injustice. The abstract political words, the meaning of which they hardly understand themselves, sound ridiculous on the staircase where Fyodor does the job he has to do and which makes him respectable. This scene works as a practical illustration for Preobrazhensky's statement in the novella that the proletariat should do its own job and only after that, "разруха исчезнет сама собой" (145).

In the cycle of short stories Notes of a Young Doctor ("Записки юного врача") Bulgakov also uses functional doubles for the purpose of repeating some protagonist's features. The cycle was published in 1925 and consists of seven short stories. The Young Doctor, after graduation from the university, is sent to work in the

small, remote clinic which seems lost in the endless Russian plains. He is overburdened by his position as a doctor who is responsible for the lives and health of the thousands peasants, but his feeling of duty makes him continue to learn, work, and fight disease and death.

In the short story "The Blizzard," from the cycle Notes of a Young Doctor, the functional double is created for a moment. The protagonist is called to another village to help its doctor save the life of a young, beautiful bride who was thrown from her cart when its horse unexpectedly began to gallop. The girl, who was thrown against a post in the accident, is dying. When the protagonist comes into the room where the girl is lying, he is surprised to see that he and the doctor who sent for help are both equally young. He notices, "Мы были похожи на два портрета одного и того же лица, да и одного и того же года" (105). In this case the double for the young doctor repeats one particular characteristic of the protagonist: his fear of not properly performing his duty, which stems from the Young Doctor's more basic feeling of overwhelming responsibility. This double appears only momentarily in this story, as it does in "Heart of a Dog," and is a functional double, as well. However, in "Blizzard," the affinities between the two doctors have an almost supernatural quality and makes this double appear as a *doppelgänger*. This double is a real man, but by some fantastic force he turns into the embodiment of the protagonist's fear and helplessness. As Andrew Webber observes, the classic double is often used by writers as a means of pointing at the hero's "profound insecurity" (9). The Young Doctor in this story is exhausted to such a degree that he sees everything as in a dream or nightmare. He is reduced to a state of acute vulnerability: he can do nothing to

save the girl, and he is worn out because of the inordinate number of the patients he treats in his job. Thus, the functional double reveals the Young Doctor's fear, and his constant feeling of helplessness before death, which haunts every minute of his medical practice.

Bulgakov uses the same kind of functional doubles in the short story, "Fire of the Khans," in order to repeat the protagonist's character traits. In this short story, the former owner of a grand palace, prince Tugay-Beg, returns incognito to Soviet Russia to learn what has happened to his palace, which was nationalized after the Bolshevik revolution. His initial intention changes when he sees that people are treating his property as if it is their own and are openly declaring their contempt for the former owners of the estate, the members of the Tugay-Beg aristocratic family: "Realizing his impotence against this change, the prince sets fire to the house" (Milne 55). He reveals his real identity to his former servant and present keeper of the palace, Ion, and talks to him alone in the empty palace. The reader realizes that in spite of their opposite positions on the social ladder, the two men resemble each other in many ways. Both of them hate the communist regime and dream of the return of the happy past, both are loyal to each other and to the palace which is a physical embodiment of their past happy lives, and both have an unchangeable code of behavior to which they are completely devoted. Ion is not scared to show his negative attitude to the new regime and his loyalty to the owners of the house, and proudly presents himself as the one who will always protect the dignity of people whom he loved and served. Showing the palace to the group of tourists, he is full of pride for its beauty: "Иона стоял в сторонке, и гордость мерцала у него на бритом сморщенном лице тихо, по-вечернему" (386). This is his unchangeable code of behavior. For

Tugay-Beg, the same code of behavior takes a different form. He wishes to kill everyone who shows a lack of respect for his family, and fights the overwhelming desire to kill, right there and then, one of the tourists who insults his late mother. Full of hatred for the Bolsheviks, Tugay-Beg seems a "selfish, imperious and vengeful" (Milne 55) figure. However, during the talk with Ion, other aspects of the prince's character are revealed: his compassion for people, and his sense of responsibility for everyone who is loyal to him. Both men cry for the late princess, who died longing for her country. The prince kisses Ion because the princess, before her death, asked her husband to find Ion and to kiss him. Tugay-Beg gives his former servant money, carefully instructs him how to use it without being caught, and assures him that he will not have to worry. The resemblance between Tugay-Beg and Ion highlights the prince's positive characteristics and contributes to the complexity and roundness of his character.

The scene in the empty palace when the prince and his old servant secretly meet, reminds the reader of a famous closing scene from Chekhov's play "Вишневый сад."(1903). Bulgakov does not hide the allusion to Chekhov's work. He gives to the old servant a rare name, "Ion," as Chekhov did when he gave to Ranevskaya's old servant the rare name "Firs," and both servants are left by their masters in their houses. Both old men are devoted to their masters to the point that they do not have their own lives, but lives that are connected to the lives of their masters. However, in spite of Ranevskaya's and her family member's lavish generosity, sick Firs is forgotten in the affluent house. Against such allusion, Tugay-Beg's action toward his servant is strikingly admirable, and adds to his characterization the feature of a noble man.

In the short story "Morphine," Bulgakov also portrays characters in pairs. The framing story is narrated by the Young Doctor who is reading the diary of his former university friend, Doctor Polyakov. The diary, which constitutes the main narrative, is a story about Polyakov's addiction to morphine and his struggle to overcome this addiction. Two women play an important role in Polyakov's life and Bulgakov presents them as a pair. The particularity of this pair is that they not only complement each other, but contribute to the characterization of the protagonist. One of them is Doctor Polyakov's former lover, the singer Amneris. The other is his current mistress, the nurse Anna Kirillovna. Significantly, their names both begin with the letter "A." Bulgakov often gives two characters similar names that sound alike in order to emphasize their similarity, or their similar function, in the story. For example, in "Diaboliada," the protagonist's last name is Korotkov, and his double has the last name Kolobkov, a name which not only begins with the letter "K," but sounds similar as well. And, as previously noted, in "Heart of a Dog," one of the main characters, Sharikov, and his counterpart, Shvonder, have names beginning with the letter "Ш."

The two women are presented as opposite characters. Amneris is an exceptional figure, first of all, because of her "ясный, громадный голос" (157), and also because, as the text suggests, she is a leading singer in the Moscow theater. In memory of her lover, Doctor Polyakov, she always wears her characters' costumes, which creates a sense of additional mystery about her. She leaves Doctor Polyakov under circumstances that are not explained, but the reader witnesses his suffering because of their separation. The doctor cannot live with his loneliness and finds relief in morphine. While Amneris is

portrayed as a *femme fatale*, the nurse Anna Kirillovna is the opposite: she is modest, patient, and devoted to Doctor Polyakov. He feels responsible for ruining her life. "Погубил я только себя. И Анну" (175), he writes in his diary.

The character of Anna Kirillovna continues the long tradition in Russian literature of depicting an almost perfect woman who lives in order to devote herself to someone, usually to a man who is not able to achieve anything positive because of some weakness in his character. The most famous of these women is Tatiana Larina, the heroine of Pushkin's novel in verse Евгений Онегин. However, the writer who created an entire gallery of perfect women was Ivan Turgenev. The heroines in his novels, Рудин (1855), Дворянское гнездо (1858), and Дым (1867) have in common the ability to be supportive and faithful to the man they love despite of his inability to succeed in life and love. Each woman has an element of masochism in her personality because traditionally the male protagonist does not fully understand and, more importantly, does not appreciate the greatness of her love.

Anna Kirillovna possesses all of these qualities of a woman who can make her man happy, as Doctor Polyakov himself admits: "Я думал, что только в романах бывают такие, как эта Анна. И если я когда-нибудь поправлюсь, я навсегда соединю свою судьбу с нею" (171). This allusion to novels that include such exceptional female characters, indicates Bulgakov's intent to present Anna Kirillovna as the latest character in the well-known gallery of such women. Moreover, her life is tragic because she witnesses the slow death of her beloved man.

Although Amneris and Anna Kirillovna have contrasting personalities, they play

the same fatal role in the life of Doctor Polyakov. Amneris, by leaving him, becomes the reason for his deep depression, and Anna Kirillovna gives him his first injection of morphine. In this respect, they are functional doubles who play the same role in the life of the protagonist. They also symbolically represent problems that the protagonist cannot solve. He can neither overcome the loss of a beloved woman nor his addiction to morphine. These two female characters, who are portrayed as counterparts, represent the force of circumstances with which the protagonist interacts. The repetition of Doctor Polyakov's character traits, which is his self-centeredness, is emphasized via his relationship with two women. They are opposite in character, lifestyle, and the feelings they have for Polyakov, but his attitude to them is the same. In fact, he uses them both. Although we do not know what kind of relationship Polyakov had with Amneris, we witness his inability to admit that she has the right to live her life as she wants. Inner monologues, presented in Polyakov's diary, show the struggle of his two selves. One self theoretically admits that Amneris has the right to live her life her own way, but another self is ready to kill her: "Гимназически глупо с площадной бранью обрушиваться на женщину за то, что она ушла! Не хочет жить – ушла . . . Убить ее? Убить?" (157). The most interesting aspect of these monologues is that two different feelings are expressed, often in the same chain of sentences, thus showing that no one of Polyakov's selves takes over the other.

Polyakov's relationship with Anna Kirillovna is presented to the reader in considerable detail because he writes a great deal about it in his diary. Although he always notes, with gratefulness, her love and care for him, he never takes any action to make her

life easier, or at least to listen to her with respect. He lies to her about his desire to be free of his addiction to morphine. Thus, his self-centeredness takes over his feeling of gratefulness. Although, as I pointed out above, the two women are complete opposites, the differences between them become less important, while their similarity is emphasized. This similarity lies in the protagonist's attitude toward them. Thus, his self-centeredness becomes more obvious for the reader because his character trait displays itself twice.

In conclusion, in this chapter I investigated how Bulgakov uses the technical device of the double in order to build images of his characters. It is a traditional technique and is frequently present in his short narratives. The double functions as a foil for highlighting almost every character trait of the original, as Doctor Bormental does for Professor Preobrazhensky in "Heart of a Dog." The presence of the double also marks one particular characteristic of the original, as we saw in the other examples which were investigated in this chapter. The counterpart plays the greatest role in emphasizing aspects of the original character, but Bulgakov also uses a *doppelgänger* in those works whose atmosphere permits an inclusion of fantastic elements without disturbing the realistic picture of the work as a whole.

The Device of the Double and Point of View

In the preceding chapter, I examined how the creation of a double is used by Bulgakov for characterization in his short narratives. However, one of the methods of characterization, which is characterization through point of view, should be examined separately because it belongs to those methods which are less frequently associated with characterization (Rimmon-Kenan 59). Thus, in the present chapter, I will examine how the technical device of the double strengthens the characterizing capacity of point of view. For my investigation I chose the novella "Heart of a Dog" ("Собачье сердце") because in this work, as Lesley Milne observes, points of view are "magnificently mixed" (64), and the two character-doubles, the dog Sharik and the man Sharikov, are characterized by the manipulation of point of view.

Two critics have paid close attention to the point of view in the novella "Heart of a Dog." Lesley Milne analyzes it for the purpose of characterization of two characters, Professor Preobrazhensky and the dog Sharik. Helena Goscilo, in her thorough analysis of point of view in the same novella, also discusses it in order to provide deeper insights into the characters, and includes Sharikov's characterization in her discussion. Although both analyses are interesting and accurate, they do not take into account any other relationships between the characters except their relationship on one level: between the narrator and the objects of his narration. However, according to Wallace Martin, "In order to understand the functional importance of point of view, we must extend its range of meaning to include the relationships between characters"(143). Thus, when the narrator is one of the

characters in a story and has a double, their relationship becomes an aspect of the narrator's point of view.

"Heart of a Dog" consists of nine chapters and an epilogue, but with respect to point of view, it can be divided into four sections. The dog Sharik, as a first-person narrator, narrates the first section until the third-person narrator gradually takes over. The first section ends in the fourth chapter, where Sharik's voice disappears as the result of his operation: "Весь мир перевернулся кверху дном. Потом – ничего" (154). The second section, the fifth chapter, is narrated by Doctor Bormental who is documenting the history of Sharik's transformation. This section "is a laconic account of the evolution of a grotesque creature through all its stages, and it forms a narrative bridge after which the story can be carried entirely by the theatrical devices of setting, action and dialogue" (Milne 65). The third section begins in chapter six, when Sharikov emerges as a man, continues through to the end of the first part of the epilogue, and is narrated by an omniscient third-person narrator. The fourth section, consisting only of half a page, and including Sharik's inner monologue, is narrated by a third-person narrator, with Sharik as a focalizer. Thus, with respect to point of view, the last section is similar to the first.

The novella begins with Sharik's monologue about being burned by the cook from the "столовой нормального питания"(119). He is ready to die and produces a long philosophical monologue about his miserable existence, people's cruelty, and life in post-revolutionary Moscow. The dog's vision of life contributes to the process of defamiliarizaion, which Victor Shklovsky believes is the main purpose of art. In his celebrated essay, "Art as Technique," Shkolvsky writes: "The technique of art is to make

objects 'unfamiliar,' to make forms difficult" (20). By describing an object from a different or unexpected point of view, the writer enables the reader to see a well-known thing from a different perspective, and thus helps him or her to understand its significance which was obliterated by the process of habitualization.

As an example of defamiliarization, Shklovsky uses a passage from Leo Tolstoy's novella "Холстомер" (1888): "He [Leo Tolstoy] describes an object as if he were seeing it for the first time, an event as if it were happening for the first time" (21). Tolstoy often achieves this effect by manipulating the point of view in the text, as when, for example, he describes people's lives through the eyes of a horse: "The narrator of 'Kholstomer'. . . is a horse, and it is the horse point of view (rather than a person's) that makes the content of the story seem unfamiliar" (Shklovsky 21). Thus, Tolstoy changes the relationship between the narrator and the objects of his narration by replacing the familiar human perspective by an unfamiliar one. Gogol in his short story "Diary of a Madman" ("Записки сумасшедшего") (1835) achieves similar effect by including the correspondence between the two dogs. In the dog's letters common human behavior is discussed as strange and unexplainable. Bulgakov uses the same technique of creating a new perspective on life by giving the dog the right to narrate in the first-person.

The first-person point of view is essentially limited and " is biased by definition" (Stanzel 150), because the events and characters are perceived through the consciousness of one mind and because "any first-person narrative . . . may prove unreliable because it issues from a speaking or writing self addressing someone" (Martin 142). Moreover, in Bulgakov's story this "person" is a dog. In order to make this dog's thoughts seem

authentic, Bulgakov has to present Sharik's perception of life as seen by an animal, not by a human. This requirement further limits Sharik's knowledge as a narrator. In order to overcome this limitation, Bulgakov includes an omniscient narrator in the first section.

Bulgakov is able to make Sharik's thoughts seem like an animal's by carefully focusing on a dog's central concern: his constant return to the problem of food. Sharik meditates on people's motivations and actions, the social structure of the new communist society, and even medical problems, and connects all these topics to his desire to grab a piece of food, "перехватить кус"(120). However, unless his topic is food, Sharik's knowledge is far from being limited. The reader accepts this strategy because Bulgakov provides a formal explanation for Sharik's knowledge -- the dog can read: "Из сорока тысяч московских псов разве уж какой-нибудь совершенный идиот не умеет сложить слово 'колбаса'" (125). This formal explanation gives Bulgakov an opportunity to create the dog's speech as a combination of different voices. Sharik's monologue is a fascinating example of heteroglossia. The cliches from Bolshevik newspapers are mixed with street slang, phrases from official documents, and the elevated diction typical of nineteenth-century novels.

The word "пролетарий" is used throughout the dog's monologue. This political term became very popular after the revolution for use in any Bolshevik piece of propaganda, especially in newspapers: "Какая гадина, а еще пролетарий . . . Дворники из всех пролетариев самая гнусная мразь" (120). After such revelations, the dog suddenly uses phrases that would be appropriate in business letters: "Бок болит нестерпимо, и даль моей карьеры видна мне совершенно

отчетливо" (119). Other phrases are ironic because of their obvious reference to romantic novels: "Все испытал, с судьбою своею мирюсь и если плачу сейчас, то только от физической боли, потому что дух мой еще не угас" (120). All these phrases are in effect a parody of their sources's material because of their juxtaposition with street slang and swearing, such as in the statement, "Жадная тварь. Вы гляньте когда-нибудь на его рожу: ведь он поперек себя шире! Вор с медной мордой" (119). Thus, the reader perceives Sharik's sharp remarks about the world as the authentic remarks of a dog because his ability to read enables him to find these remarks in different sources, while his dog's perspective turns them into a parody.

Shifting from Sharik's first-person narration to the third-person narration, Bulgakov continues to tell the story as it is seen through Sharik's eyes, that is, by keeping Sharik as a focalizer and creating the situation in which the "narrator seems to have delegated the function of seeing to the character" (Martin 143). Hence, Bulgakov still has the same access to Sharik's consciousness as he had during the period of first-person narration.

The shift from Sharik's first-person narration to the third-person authorial narration occurs almost unnoticed because it begins with frequent shifts from first to third-person point of view and back, sometimes within one paragraph without any syntactic indication of shifting: "Пес мгновенно оборвал кожуру, с всхлипыванием вгрызся в краковскую и сожрал ее в два счета. При этом подавился колбасой и снегом до слез, потому что от жадности едва не заглотал веревочку. Еще, еще лижу вам руку. Целую штаны, мой благодетель!" (123). In this paragraph,

the third-person narrator speaks in the first two sentences, and Sharik speaks as a first-person narrator in the last two sentences. There is no indication of the shift in perspective between the two parts of the paragraph.

"Heart of a Dog" is an example of a work where change in point of view is especially subtle and occurs without any visible signals. Seymour Chatman, in his Story and Discourse, writes that point of view is "one of the most troublesome of critical terms" (151). I believe that one of the reasons for such trouble is the fact that the point of view is not always consistent throughout the whole work. In his work Проблемы поэтики Достоевского, Mikhail Bakhtin points out the complexities of indicating such a change in point of view. Analyzing Dostoevsky's novella "The Double," Bakhtin finds that shifting from one voice to another occurs even within a single sentence and that "автор в любом месте может поставить кавычки, не изменяя ни тона, ни голоса, ни построения фразы" (254). Bakhtin means that even words next to each other in one sentence can belong to different voices. In "The Double," such a shift in point of view occurs because the protagonist, Jakob Golyadkin, has a split personality, and his second self eventually becomes an independently existing man, Golyadkin's *doppelgänger.* The device of the double enables Dostoevsky to create "скрещение и пересечение в каждом элементе сознания и слова двух сознаний, двух точек зрения, двух оценок" and, in this work, different voices coincide in a single word "как ни в одном из произведений Достоевского" (245). Therefore, the creation of a *doppelgänger* enables Dostoevsky to create a dialogue between the two selves within the monologue of the protagonist.

What happens in Bulgakov's "Heart of a Dog" is similar to Dostoevsky's "The Double," but Sharik's consciousness is shared not by the character and his second self, but the character and the omniscient narrator, and there is no tension existing between these two voices. There is no tension between other voices in Sharik's monologue as well. Unlike Golyadkin's inner monologues, different voices in Sharik's monologue do not argue with each other, but contribute instead to the development of the ideas of the dog's monologue. Thus, we meet not with crossing dialogues within the hero's monologue, but a multitude of monologues of different voices within Sharik's monologue.

While perceiving the world of the novella through the dog's point of view is very interesting in itself, this point of view acquires a deeper meaning because Sharik has a biological double, Sharikov, whose point of view, although a man's, is not included in the novella. Sharik and Sharikov are doubles by virtue of sharing one, albeit transformed, body. This pair of doubles' most striking feature is that they do not remember each other. Neither Sharikov nor the dog remember what happened to him in his previous life. A slight connection between their consciousnesses exists only by two words, "рыба" and "Главрыба." Sharikov utters them first when he becomes a human being and starts talking. The same words are also very important to the dog because they are the first words he ever read. However, this weak connection quickly disappears, and the dog passes along only one character trait to the man: a hatred of cats.

To the best of my knowledge, no precedent for such doubles exists in Russian literature, but in English literature, an example does exist in the "most famous of all . . . second-self stories"(Keppler 8), R. L. Stevenson's "The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and

Mr. Hyde." In this story, the scientist Doctor Jekyll invents a new potion that divides him into his good and evil selves. This division is both spiritual and physical, for the virtuous and austere scholar, Dr.Jekyll, and the evil dwarf Hyde occupy the same mind and body at different times: "Once the evil side of Jekyll's nature has been released, . . . it acts robustly, and feeds on its pale shadow the virtuous Dr. Jekyll, like a parasite" (Bravo 367). Thus, these doubles share one mind and one body, both transformed, between them. In contrast to Stevenson's characters, however, Bulgakov's characters do not possess the main trait of doubles from the "Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde" which Albert J. Guerard defines as "poignant and authentic longing to keep both selves alive" (9). The absence of this trait in Bulgakov's doubles is an explicable result from the absence of a shared memory.

If we look at Sharik and Sharikov as doubles and, consequently, as two characters that lend themselves to our comparison, we notice that while a large part of Bulgakov's novella is told from the dog's perspective with "the dog taking over the narration for much of the story" (Wright 62), events are never presented through Sharikov's eyes, so that "at no stage is the reader brought into proximity with Sharikov" (Goscilo 287). Bulgakov refuses to accept Sharikov's point of view of the world, and prefers to explore the mind of an animal rather than that of a man such as Sharikov. In this respect, Bulgakov depicts Sharikov in the same way that Dostoevsky depicts Smerdyakov in his novel Братья Карамазовы (1878 – 1880): "Он Смердяков . . . преподается автором как некоторая загадка . . . разрешить которую предстоит не непосредственно самому автору (путем проникновения в сознание описываемого им

персонажа), но героям данного произведения" (Успенский 124). To the other characters in "Heart of a Dog," Sharikov is also a riddle. They do not understand Sharikov's type of thinking and motivation.

In contrast, by revealing Sharik's inner thoughts, Bulgakov is able to portray the dog's admirable characteristics; for example, he demonstrates the dog's capacity to be logical and appreciative. Receiving a piece of sausage from Preobrazhensky, the dog instantly becomes his admirer, and later, living in the Professor's apartment, he feels an overwhelming gratefulness which never disappears: "Глаза его теперь не менее двух раз в день заливались благодарными слезами по адресу пречистенского мудреца" (147). Moreover, by showing Sharik's inner thoughts and feelings, Bulgakov also explains the dog's motivations. For example, Bulgakov allows the reader to understand Sharik's aggressiveness, such as when Sharik bites Doctor Bormental, and we understand that biting is a dog's natural response to being threatened or attacked. Thus, the damage that the dog causes is understood by the reader and justified by the author.

The same is not true with Sharikov, the dog's biological successor. In contrast to the dog, Sharikov demands from Preobrazhensky complete service for his endless needs: "Where Sharik was the appealing and relatively passive victim, Sharikov is the selfish, cowardly, and destructive victimizer who initiates the disastrous incidents that bring his creators to the brink of despair" (Goscilo 287). However, his demands and threats are shown only from the outside. The reader does not know what Sharikov thinks or feels when he harasses his creators, steals, or attempts to rape Zina. In comparison to the dog's motivations, Sharikov's are impossible to understand by a civilized mind. Thus, by

focalising through the dog Sharik, and getting to know his good characteristics, his double's, that is, the man Sharikov's, despicable characteristics become more clear, seem more disgusting and "criminal."

However, these important conclusions can be made only if we perceive Sharik and Sharikov as doubles and compare them as a result of this particular relationship. Their relationship becomes an aspect of Sharik's point of view when he is a narrator or focalizer. Interestingly, the significance of this aspect comes out not at the moment when the reader reads the dog's monologue, but later, when the reader realizes that Sharik's double, Sharikov, is deprived of his own point of view by the author. As a result of manipulating the point of view in the novella, Bulgakov contributes to the process of characterization of Sharik and Sharikov, but the most striking part of Sharikov's character, its enigmatic quality, is highlighted when the point of view is accompanied by the device of the double.

The Device of the Double and the Scope of the World in the Short Story and Novella

> "The selection of a genre limits the author's ability to manipulate his material and at the same time opens to him the possibilities inherent in that kind of narrative treatment" (Leibowitz 18).

In the previous two chapters, I examined how the device of the double is used by Bulgakov for characterization, and for establishing a point of view which indirectly works for characterization as well. This is the traditional, and the main, purpose for using the device of the double, and, as I showed in the previous chapters, Bulgakov continues to use this technique in his works. However, as I mentioned in the introductory chapter, the device of the double in Bulgakov's short narratives has a larger application. Bulgakov uses this technique in order to meet the requirements which the genre of short narrative impose. Nicole Bravo and Albert Guerard observe that the device of the double is well suited to the genre of short story and novella. However, no one critic has made an effort to investigate why the authors of short narratives make use of the double more often than authors of the novel. Thus, in the present chapter, I would like to investigate why the device of the double suites Bulgakov's short stories and novellas so well. However, some preliminary remarks should be made about the genres of the short story and the novella in order to posit an answer to this question.

Mary Rohrbenger writes about the independent story: "The short story, as we know it today, is the newest of literary genres" (80). The theory of the short story

emerged together with this genre, and Edgar Allan Poe was the first to theorize it. He writes, in his essay "Review of Twice-Told Tales," that in the short story, "the unity of effect or impression is a point of the greatest importance" (46). Brander Matthews believes that the modern short story, which originated in the nineteenth century, is characterized by brevity, a closely wrought texture, freedom from excrescence, and a unity of effect. He also emphasizes that the essential element of a short story is "compression, a vigorous compression" (53). Anton Chekhov also pointed to the brevity of the short story as its essential feature. In a letter to his brother, Chekhov formulated his view on the short story genre. He wrote that the short story should comply with six requirements: "1) Absence of long-winded tirades of a political, social and economic nature; 2) thorough-going objectivity; 3) truthfulness in the description of characters and objects; 4) total brevity; 5) daring and originality; keep away from cliches; 6) warmth of feeling" (qtd. in Moser16). Two out of his six principles refer to the brevity of the form. Thus, we can draw the conclusion – from statements made by the masters of short narratives, and prominent critics of these genres – that the principle of economy is the main principle to which an author of short narratives must adhere.

The necessity for economy arises from the fact that the short story and the novella are shorter in length than novel. Yuri Tynyanov in Роэтика. История литературы. Кино, writes about this phenomena: "Роман отличен от новеллы тем, что он – большая форма. Поэма от просто стихотворения – тем же. Расчет на большую форму не тот, что на малую, каждая деталь, каждый стилистический прием в зависимости от величины конструкции имеет

разную функцию . . . Раз сохранен этот принцип конструкции, сохраняется . . . ощущение жанра" (256). This interdependence of form and content of the work is less noticeable in the genre of the novel, but most obvious in more compact genres. This occurs because of the tension that emerges between the short narrative as narrative by nature, and the conventions of the short story and novella as genre. Any narrative has an innate force for expansion because of the narrator's fundamental desire to communicate all possible aspects of information he intends to pass on to the listener. However, the conventions of the short story and the novella as genres, in particular their shorter length, limit this potential. Thus, an author of a short narrative uses different devices in order to stay within the boundaries of the genre, but also to be able to communicate everything he wants to convey to the listener or reader. Gerald Gillespie rightly suggests that the most relevant example of this purpose is the decision of a writer of a short narrative to select important events in the lives of the characters in which the whole pattern of life is reflected, or is altered (qtd. in Leibowitz 52).

However, the depiction of a single event, or a limited number of events, always has a potential for distorting the impression of reality, because life does not consist of only one or a few events. Yet, it is exactly the creation of illusion of reality that is essential to a realistic work. Thus, the task of a writer, who works in a realistic mode, is to foreground the events of the short narrative. This larger foreground emerges by the inclusion of secondary subject matters, themes, subplots, and a larger number of characters. The limitedness of a short narrative manifests itself in the lack of opportunity to include them, but they do exist in the compact narratives and become one of the vehicles for the realistic

impression of short narratives.

In this chapter, I turn only to the investigation of the role of the secondary themes which are present in Bulgakov's short narratives. The secondary themes broaden the scope of the short narrative by inserting the fictive world of the work into the concrete historical and cultural moment. As a result, everything that happens in the story becomes a part of a larger picture, and the illusion of reality is preserved. As well, the secondary themes connect the main theme of the story, if it has a limited scope, with larger, more universal, themes.

As Judith Leibowitz points out, in her comprehensive study Narrative Purpose in the Novella, the secondary themes in short narratives, as opposed to those in novels, often are only suggested (52). The shorter the length of the work, the shorter the markers that point to the secondary themes. Sometimes the only signs of them are details of setting, which are not developed in the longer part of a work. It can be said that a short-short story, such as those by O'Henry, have very few signs of secondary themes. Thus, I shall investigate how the device of the double in Bulgakov's short narratives works toward indicating the secondary themes and, therefore, contributes to the creation of a foreground for the main events or the main theme of the work. I chose for the analysis two of Bulgakov's works: the novella "Heart of a Dog" ("Собачье сердце"), and the short story "Fire of the Khans" ("Ханский огонь"), because in these two works this device indicates explicitly the secondary themes of the work.

In the novella, "Heart of a Dog," two pairs of doubles function as the indicators of the secondary themes. The first pair is two of Professor Preobrazhensky's patients, who

are described through the dog Sharik's perspective. The first patient is an elderly man who wants to have an exciting sex life and goes through with a complex and expensive treatment. He is happy with the treatment, and looks absolutely ridiculous in his embroidered underpants and green hair. He had tried to color his hair, in order to look younger, but the new Soviet manufacturer had sold him a liquid that turned his hair green. The second patient is a woman who comes to ask the Professor for an operation which makes her younger because she has a young cardsharp lover. Both patients are described as grotesque figures obsessed with sex and youthful appearance. Many details are given by Bulgakov in order to complete the picture of two people. The effect produced by the dog's vision of the situation is hilarious because the dog sees all intimate things that usually are hidden from human eyes. Both patients also confess to Professor Preobrazhensky their vulgar and ridiculous love stories. The dog, apparently, does not understand the subject of the confessions and admits with embarrassment, "Ну вас к черту . . . и стараться не буду понять, что это за штука, все равно не пойму" (134). Although one patient is a man, and the other is a woman, their behavior and life-goals are the same. Not only do they behave alike from the dog's perspective, but the reader also sees them as two variants of one person. This pair of doubles presents the secondary theme which is the theme of people's vanity and the vacuity of their lives.

This theme is not developed but potentially is important and creates a social context in which the main conflict, between aggressive ignorance and reason, unfolds. It creates an atmosphere of a concrete historical time when complete economical disorder in post-Revolutionary Russia produced a division of people into two groups: one that lives in

hunger, but tries to earn an honest living; and another group that makes money by dubious machinations and lose themselves in hedonistic pleasure. The pattern of life for the latter group of people is presented through Sharik's monologue in which he mimics the words of the poor typist's boss: "Я теперь председатель, и сколько ни накраду – все, все на женское тело, на раковые шейки, на "Абрау-Дюрсо"! Потому что наголодался в молодости достаточно, будет с меня, а загробной жизни не существует" (121). This secondary theme situates the very private world of Prebrazhensky's apartment in the larger world of post-revolutionary Moscow, and establishes a social and moral context for the events that happen in this apartment.

Another pair of doubles in "Heart of a Dog" consists of the two representatives of the new Communist regime. Both are people with power who protect Professor Preobrazhensky because, the reader can presume, they both went through the Professor's operation for rejuvenation. One of them is an unseen man with whom the Professor speaks by phone when the House Committee's members come to expropriate part of his apartment. The man on the phone is not visible, but his power is reflected in the behavior of the members of the House Committee. After talking to this man, Shvonder looks "оплеванным"(139), and the committee has to leave the Professor alone. This unseen man is so powerful that his few words change the situation completely. There is nothing said about him except his name, "Виталий Александрович." This man has his double who, at the very end of the novella, visits the Professor to warn him about the denunciation that Sharikov wrote to the CheKa. This man, in opposition to Виталий Александрович, has no name, but his appearance is described in detail. He is fat and

tall, and wears an army uniform. There is some mystery about these two men; in fact, the reader does not know if this fat man in uniform is the same Виталий Александрович, or another of the Professor's protectors. Bulgakov gives to one man only a name, and to the other one an appearance and speech These doubles continue the theme that Bulgakov explored in "Diaboliada;" that is, that a bureaucratic system rejects the individuality of people to such a degree that they all look and act alike. However, this theme of political power and bureaucratic systems is more complex in "Heart of a Dog" than in "Diaboliada." Two powerful men in the novella are good and intelligent. They protect the Professor and side with him, not with Sharikov. The second man says about the dog-turned-to-man: "Но какая все-таки дрянь!" (203). The presentation of people with political power as good people gives this secondary theme an additional complexity. The reader sees Professor Preobrazhensky's hostility to the new regime and understands that Bulgalkov puts in the Professor's words his own political attitude. Thus, a logical conclusion is that the bulk of Bulgakov's satire of people who serve the Communist regime should be placed upon the regime's leaders. However, Bulgakov does not simplify the problem, and posits a question about the position of an intelligent person working in a system of political power. This theme becomes fully explored in his novel The Master and Margarita, and is connected with the character Pontius Pilate.

The same secondary theme of the nature of political power and the people who serve it exists in the short story "Fire of the Khans." As in "Heart of a Dog," this theme is introduced to the reader by the device of the double. The protagonist of this story, the prince Tugay-Beg, returns to Bolshevik Russia to see his ancestral palace. He pretends to

be an ordinary tourist and moves with a group of them around the palace. One man in the group attracts everyone's attention because of his strange appearance: "Человек был совершенно голый, если не считать коротеньких штанишек . . . да еще пенсне на носу. . . Коричневая застарелая сыпь покрывала сутуловатую спину голого человека" (385). This half-naked man is the epitome of the new Bolshevik regime. He is full of hatred for the former owners of the house, and during the tour makes offensive remarks about Tugay-Beg's family. His remarks produce confusion among the tourists and inflame Tugay-Beg's anger. Later, during his conversation with his former servant, Ion, the prince admits that he struggled with an overwhelming desire to kill the half-naked man on the spot. When Tugay-Beg is alone in his former study, he starts talking aloud – asking himself, the portraits of his predecessors and friends – about changes that happened in his life. He feels that he does not exist for Russia, and for people living in Russia, he is a museum piece as is his palace: "По живой моей крови, среди всего живого шли и топтали, как по мертвому. Может быть, действительно я мертв? Я – тень?" (398). It seems to Tugay-Beg that the people in the portraits are alive, that they listen to him, and even begin to move. Phantoms fill the house, and it seems that the half-naked man appears in the dark hall. One photograph, in particular, grabs the prince's attention. It is a picture of a large group of men wearing cavalry uniforms, with one very plain man in the center of the picture: "Подавлял белых напряженных кавалеристов маленький человек, как подавляла на бронзе надпись о нем. Каждое слово в ней с заглавной буквы" (397). For Tugay-Beg, there is something very strange and disturbing about this man, and Bulgakov does not

clarify what it is, but we can presume from the prince's monologue that he finds a strange resemblance between the powerful man in the picture and the half-naked man. Tugay-Beg says about these doubles incoherently: "Одно, одно из двух: или это мертво . . . а он . . . тот . . . этот . . . жив . . . или я . . . не поймешь" (397). As often happens in Bulgakov's works, the enigma is not explained and he leaves the reader with the task of solving it. What is obvious is that he is using the double for presenting the complexity of life where no clear answers exist. The man, who once was a leader of the political group loyal to the Russian monarchy, bears a striking resemblance to the man who viciously hates this monarchy. Thus, the secondary theme of the elusiveness of politics, and the impossibility of defining good and evil in the system of politics, is presented by the device of the double. Bulgakov suggests that any political power is corrupt, and any person who is a part of it becomes a bearer of its corruption. Thus, the events of the story which concentrate on Tugay-Beg's personal tragedy become one facet of a larger picture of political power, its representatives, and its victims.

Bulgakov uses the mysterious double in this short story because the setting of this work has some mysterious elements: the abandoned palace seems haunted by the phantoms of former "боевой славы, позора, любви, ненависти, порока, разврата" (388). The prince is lost in the struggle between his feelings of loneliness and his feelings of hatred, and precisely in such moments reality changes its form and suggests unreal and uncanny dimensions. One of these uncanny dimensions is the appearance of doubles.

All three examples of the doubles that I explored in this chapter typify the

metaphorical implications of the device of the double. In the first example, two of Professor Preobrazhensky's patients are character-metaphors of the new regime. They belong to that social group which is born as a result of new Communist regime and thrive during this period. The fact that there are two of them also points to the fact that this phenomenon is not an exception. The other two doubles from the same novella are character-metaphors of the new political power whose representatives do not have faces and names. In the short story "Fire of the Khans," the doubles become a metaphor for the circumvention of the political power, and the tragic fate of those who believe in political justice.

As we can see, the device of the double in "Heart of a Dog," indicates the secondary themes which establish a larger context for the events of the story. The focus is on the turmoil that happens in the Professor Preobrazhensky's apartment, but the appearance of the doubles suggests the social and moral situation in the country and foreshadows the events that happen in the isolated world of Preobrazhensky's apartment. In the short story "Fire of the Khans," the doubles become a crystallization of a larger theme of political corruption. The novella "Heart of a Dog" is longer than the short story "Fire of the Khans," and thus the indication of secondary themes are more elaborated. In the short story, however, the secondary themes take the form of a mere suggestion.

The Device of the Double and the Theme of a Short Narrative

As I mention in the introductory chapter, the device of the double is viewed by critics exclusively as a means of characterization, and I shall attempt to show that this device works for other elements in the short narrative as well. Thus, in the present chapter I shall explore how the device of the double is used in Bulgakov's short narratives to contribute to the elaboration of the main themes of the works. Alexander Zholkovsky writes: "Text is 'theme' elaborated by 'expressive devices'" (Zholkovsky 24). I believe that the device of the double is one of these "expressive" devices that help to turn theme into text. Like many other technical devices, it builds flesh and gives blood to the skeleton which is the theme of a work.

The concept of "theme" belongs to those concepts that are like air: it is the most necessary element, but we rarely think of it. The same is true with theme: it is a basic element of a literary work, but it usually is left unnoticed during analysis or is used as a point of departure for the analysis of other elements. In Themes and Texts, Yuri Scheglov and Alexander Zholkovsky observe, "Yet out of caution or for some other reason [critics] avoid explicitly formulating this unit of meaning as the theme of the work" (7). I believe that the concept of theme is one of the most valuable and influential concepts and I agree with Scheglov and Zholkovsky that, "A paper on poetics must obviously include some explicit formulation of the theme (or themes)" (7). In A Handbook to Literature we find the definition of theme: "In poetry, drama, and fiction it is the abstract concept which is made concrete through its representation in person, action, and image in the work"

(Thrall, Hibbard 486). Although it is difficult to find in the critical works, even on the subject of narratology, a separate entry devoted to the concept of theme, it seems that a majority of critics share the same view on the definition, which is similar to that expressed by Thrall and Hibbard. In this study, I will also use the term "theme" as a general concept of the work which is made persuasive to the reader by means of an infinite number of elements and technical devices.

Every critic of Bulgakov's works (Proffer, Milne, Wright among others) point out two particular features regarding the themes of his works. First, they admit that Bulgakov, in the very beginning of his literary career, establishes themes to which he remains constant. As Ellendea Proffer writes: "The prose of these early years contains a surprising number of details and themes which find their final expression and resolution in his last novel" (76). Second, they emphasize that the success of a large number of his works is a consequence of "reinforcing the themes" (Wright 63). Thus, in this chapter, I will localize three themes to which Bulgakov remained faithful all his creative life, and will investigate how the device of the double functions in his short stories as a tool for transforming the main theme of the work into a universal one. My assumption is that this device has a metaphorical nature, and, as a result of using it in the works, provides the effect of interpreting a single incident as a reflection of the larger problems shared by humanity in general.

The first theme to which I shall turn our investigation is the theme of the danger that bureaucratic machinery holds for the identity of an individual. Bulgakov turns to this theme in the short stories "Diaboliada" ("Дьяволиада"), "Notes on the Cuffs"

("Записки на манжетах"), and many others. He continues this theme in his plays, especially in Александр Пушкин (1935), and fully explores it in The Master and Margarita.

In "Diaboliada," the subtitle, "How Twins Destroyed a Clerk," foreshadows this story's motif of the double, and alludes to Dostoevsky's novella "The Double." Dostoevsky's novella provides a deep psychological analysis of the behavior of a person who is lost in contemporary society, and is finally driven to madness because of his everyday frustration and unrealized ambitions. As Dmitri Chizhevsky explains, in his essay "The Theme of the Double in Dostoevsky," the central character, the insignificant clerk Jakob Golyadkin, "has no place of his own, he has never achieved one in his life, he has no "sphere" of his own in life except possibly the corner behind the cupboard or the stove where he hides from the imaginary persecutions of his enemies" (116). The annihilating force of society, in which the bureaucratic system is a pivotal base, is embodied in Golyadkin's double, a man who looks exactly like Golyadkin Senior, sits behind the desk next to him, does the same job, and even has the same name. This Golyadkin Junior gradually replaces Golyadkin Senior in the office and in his private life: "The appearance of the double and his success in squeezing out Golyadkin from his place only shows that Golyadkin's place was completely illusory to begin with" (Chizhevsky 116). The reader cannot be sure if Golyadkin Junior really exists, or if he is purely a product of Golyadkin Senior's disturbed mind, but in spite of this ambiguity, it is obvious that Golyadkin's double represents those ambitions that Golyadkin himself secretly cherished all his life and never realized.

Bulgakov's novella "Diaboliada" begins by establishing the similarly illusory belief of the protagonist, the insignificant clerk Korotkov, who now works not in the bureaucratic machine of the Czar's Russia, but in the allegedly free-from-exploitation Bolshevik country: "В то время, как все люди скакали с одной службы на другую, товарищ Коротков прочно служил в Главцентрбазспимате . . . и прослужил в ней целых 11 месяцев" (3). The remainder of the story presents a range of events that prove the erroneousness of Korotkov's assurance, and show that stability, not only in the office, but also in Korotkov's entire life, is an illusion.

As Ellendea Proffer points out,"While there are obvious thematic echoes of Dostoevsky's "The Double," Bulgakov modernizes many devices"(108). The device of the double is also modernized. Bulgakov creates not one, but three pairs of doubles in the story. Korotkov's boss, who is bald and incredibly short, has a double who has a long beard and is tall. As in Dostoevsky's "The Double," we do not know if these two men are really one, or if they are a product of the protagonist's imagination. The author also keeps it ambiguous. Due to this quality, Korotkov's two bosses are subjective doubles. Korotkov himself has an invisible double, somebody named Kolobkov, a Don Juan by nature and a man with a criminal reputation. People around Korotkov confuse him with Kolobkov, but Korotkov himself does not know whether they really look alike, or if there is something supernatural about it. Hence, Korotkov and his double are objective doubles and are also an enigma for the reader. The third pair of doubles is Korotkov and his reflection in the mirror of the elevator: "Зеркальная кабина стала падать вниз, и двое Коротковых упали вниз. Второго Короткова первый и главный забыл в

зеркале кабины и вышел один в прохладный вестибюль"(36). This protagonist's double can be considered as the middle version for the classical *doppelgänger* because it is not developed into a complete figure of the *doppelgänger,* but has all its features: the author in two sentences alludes to it not as Korotkov's reflection, but as the second Korotkov, although the reader knows that it is a reflection, and this discrepancy creates considerable ambiguity that brings to mind a supernatural force. It is also a salient element of the mode of Magic Realism which always explores the duality of the object.

Bulgakov refuses to treat the double traditionally, that is, as an embodiment of a negative, hidden second self. He plays with the double, using it as type of a literary device that can be altered in order to achieve his goals. Not every double in Bulgakov's works represents negative side of his original, and the main interest that Bulgakov has in doubles is the very fact of their existence, because it is precisely their existence that gives food for thought and, as a mirror, reflects the condition of society and of the individual within it. If in Dostoevsky's "The Double," Goliadkin Junior is a strange and ominous exception among other people, in Bulgakov's "Diaboliada," the three pairs of doubles produce a sense of the customary, suggesting that everyone has a double and no one has his or her own identity.

The doubles create a crowd which annihilates a person and in which everyone is lost. Bulgakov depicts crowds in the office buildings more so than on the streets: "Покрывая полы мокрыми пятнами, десятки людей шли навстречу Короткову или обгоняли его" (17). Even the crowd on the street consists of bureaucratic people: "В это мгновение часы далеко пробили четыре раза на

рыжей башне, и тчас из всех дверей побежали люди с портфелями" (21).

Three pairs of doubles develop the theme of the annihilating force of the bureaucratic system on a more general level, taking a single incident as a point of departure. Korotkov's boss has literally two faces and two bodies and becomes a metaphor for all supervisors in the numerous offices, and further suggests that they all have two faces. Korotkov's double, Kolobkov, is a criminal, but for society there is no difference between the harmless Korotkov and the thief Kolobkov. People are interested only in the presence of the documents, and many women are even charmed by the criminal and try to seduce him. The third pair of doubles questions the reality of Korotkov's existence itself. The author ironically states that "первый и главный"(36) Korotkov is the one who is alive, but in the very next paragraph Korotkov, coming out of the elevator, himself admits to the security officer: " Меня нельзя арестовать, потому что я неизвестно кто . . . Как ты арестуешь, ежели вместо документов – фига?" (36). He realizes his own nonexistence in society, and the reader realizes that the real Korotkov is not more alive than his double in the mirror.

The appearance of all pairs of doubles has a metaphorical nature because they are created on the principle of selection, not contiguity. If we take the first object in the pair of every double as a tenor, and the second object as a vehicle of the metaphor, we realize that there is no "contextual relationship between tenor and vehicle" (Lodge 100). There is no congruous explanation why Korotkov's boss Kalsoner changes his appearance and character, or why Kolobkov not only steals Korotkov's documents, but also looks like Korotkov's identical twin brother; why else would an ordinary reflection in the mirror be

called the "second Korotkov" by the author? In the novella we cannot find any logical reason for the appearance of the doubles, and all of them, together with other irrational elements that also are present in the work, change the discourse of the novella quite dramatically, turning the text from realistic into fantastic.

The second important theme of Bulgakov's which I would like to investigate is the theme of guilt: that is, a character's sense of regret for the actions (or lack of actions) in his past. This theme became associated with Bulgakov because of the character of Pontius Pilate in the novel The Master and Margarita. Pontius Pilate does not do enough to save Yeshua Ha-Nozri because of his fear of losing Caesar's favor. A moment of cowardice changes Pilate's life and condemns him to eternal torments. When, at the very end of the novel, Pilate meets Yeshua Ha-Nozri, Pilate has only one question: "Tell me it never happened! I implore you, tell me, it never happened?" (395). Thus, after the crucifixion, Pilate's only goal is to reject the fact of the execution as if it did not happen at all because the guilt he feels becomes a turning point in his life and changes everything. Most importantly, the values that Pilate cherished all his life are crushed. Pilate's life had stopped when Yeshua was executed and the new one cannot begin because of his feelings of guilt. Pilate starts living again only after the words of forgiveness are pronounced by the Master.

The theme of guilt is also the main theme of the short story "Red Crown" ("Красная корона") written in 1922, eighteen years before The Master and Margarita was finished. The protagonist, who is confined in an asylum, describes the events that have brought him to this place: his mother implored him to bring home his younger brother,

Kolya, who was a member of the White Volunteer Army in the Civil War. The protagonist found Kolya just before the start of a battle and waited for him in the hope that after the battle, he could be convinced to return home, but Kolya was killed by a head wound: "Не было волос и не было лба. Вместо него был красный венчик с желтыми зубьями-клочьями" (446). After his brother's death, the protagonist sees him every day at twilight and becomes ill: "Приходит в гимнастерке . . . с кривой шашкой . . . и говорит одно и тоже. Честь. Затем: 'Брат, я не могу оставить эскадрон'" (447).

The image of the younger brother personifies the protagonist's sense of inescapable guilt. The details provided about the ghost's appearance are crucial in suggesting the story's theme. The visual image of the boy with a bloody head immediately evokes an emotional response in the reader that is similar to the response of the protagonist; as a result, a long explanation of the protagonist's feelings is unnecessary. Bulgakov also emphasizes that the protagonist believes that the ghost has the same horrifying effect on other people: "Что он сделал со мной в первый раз! Он вспугнул всю клинику" (447). Bulgakov demolishes the boundary between the subjective hallucinations of the protagonist and the objective world. It is not the protagonist, an insane man, who frightens real people, but his brother-ghost who does so. Simple use of the third person pronoun "он" instead of the first person "я," changes the realistic mode of presentation to fantastic where the ghost scares people. Thus, the ghost seems more "real" than it would otherwise, and the reader forgets for a moment that it is a hallucination.

A representation of brothers or sisters as doubles is a very long folkloric and literary tradition. In the Epic of Gilgamesh, for example, the death of Gilgamesh's friend-brother, Enkidu, has such a devastating impact on Gilgamesh that his normal life ends. He undertakes a journey to the underworld, ostensibly to find a cure for his own fear of death, but in fact, to fly from the loneliness overwhelming him after the death of Enkidu. In this epic, the hero finds the cure he is seeking. He accepts death as inevitable and hears the wise words of the woman wine-maker: "When the gods created man they allotted to him death, but life they retained in their own keeping . . . Dance and be merry, feast and rejoice . . . Cherish the little child that holds your hand, and make your wife happy in your embrace; for this too is the lot of man" (34). In Bulgakov's "The Red Crown," the same motif of two brothers as an inseparable whole is used to express a different theme, the theme of guilt, which is neither curable nor escapable.

It is possible to argue that the two brothers in the "Red Crown" are not doubles because they do not share similar physical features, which is the most common trait of the majority of doubles. However, the necessary condition for two characters to be considered doubles is not their external resemblance. These two brothers resemble each other internally because of their shared sense of duty. The older brother goes insane because he does not fulfill his mission as the would-be-savior of his younger brother, and the younger one dies because he did fulfill his obligation to his fellow soldiers. Thus, the protagonist's feeling of guilt has a twofold meaning: he feels guilty for not saving the younger brother, and also for not being able to perform what the younger one accomplished. His first guilt is personified in the appearance of the ghost itself, and the second is embodied in his

repeated words: "Я не могу оставить эскадрон."(447). The similarity between the two brothers is also indicated by the oldest one's lack of a name; he is only "brother," thereby identified in terms of a relationship and the responsibility it entails.

In this short story, as in "Diaboliada," Bulgakov again creates multiple pairs of doubles. The protagonist's other double is a general who orders the hanging of a workman-bolshevik. The protagonist is a witness of the execution and realizes that people kill each other merely for trying to prove the truth of the idea they believe in. Kolya dies as a victim of this battle, but he is a solder in the army of the unnamed general who kills the workman-bolshevik. However, the protagonist takes Kolya's guilt on himself, and in an imaginary dialogue with the general says, "Помогать вам повесить я послал Колю, вешали же вы" (448). Thus, both men, the bolshevik and Kolya, become doubles because they both died for the same reason: for an idea. The difference between them is that they chose opposite political ideas and become enemies, but the passion with which they serve their chosen ideas is the strong affinity that unites them. The older brother regards the general as one of the reasons why Kolya died, and hopes that the general suffers from a guilty conscience just as he does. The protagonist and the general are doubles in that they both share the same guilt for not saving people and they are both in the same situation: they cannot change the past.

As doubles, these characters have in common only one feature and are not like the doubles in the tradition reflected in Dostoevsky's "The Double," where Golyadkin's double repeats every single feature of his original, but they are, in fact, counterparts which we meet in Dostoevsky's novels Бесы(1872) and Братья Карамазовы (1880). In the

novel Бесы, Pyotr Verhovensky can be considered a double for Stavrogin because of their one common feature: their shared obsession with theoretical discussions about Russia. The convict Fedka also shares a single trait with Stavrogin: a desire for destruction. Both Verhovensky and Fedka are very different from Stavrogin, but "an obscure but profound relationship exists between them" (Guerard 4). In the novel Братья Карамазовы, two opposite characters, Father Zossima and old Karamazov, also have only one common trait: they are both fathers. Karamazov is a biological father, the "cruel, tyrannical, despicable, sexual father of the flesh and fact" (Rogers 5), and Father Zossima is a spiritual father, "pure, revered, dignified, understanding, and loving" (Rogers 5). Thus, by creating doubles that share only one, yet crucial, feature, Bulgakov continues Dostoevsky's tradition of the universal character of human nature by uniting characters that seem to have nothing in common. By doing so he extends the theme of guilt from one person to all people, who are responsible for the deaths and suffering of others.

The third theme to which Bulgakov was faithful all his career as a writer is the theme of people's ignorance, which is very salient in The Master and Margarita. This theme originated in Bulgakov's series of short stories "Notes of a Young Doctor," *feuilletons* and novellas. In The Master and Margarita, it manifests itself through the satirical depiction of Moscow's artistic circles, which consist of people who write in order to make a good living, but who have no real talent. When the Master brings his novel about Pontius Pilate to be published, the representatives of these artistic circles cannot even understand his work. Literature is turned into a form of Bolshevik propaganda to the extent that it ceases to be literature and is condemned to become extinct. Bulgakov's

novel is set in an era when people with little or no education come to power and define the fate of the intelligentsia.

In the short story "Black as Egypt's Night" ("Тьма египетская"), which is included in the series "Notes of a Yong Doctor," experienced nurses who worked in the clinic for a long time tell the Young Doctor the most strange and ridiculous stories about the peasants' attitude toward medical science. The most striking story involves a man, Fyodor Lipoy, who put a mustard plaster on his furcoat instead of on his back. The doctor does not completely believe that anyone could be so ignorant, but he encounters almost the same situation later in the day. His patient, a peasant-miller, who is suffering from malaria, takes ten pills all at once and almost dies.

Two peasants, one in the nurse's tale and the other one in the Young Doctor's real experience, are presented as doubles because of their deep backwardness and hypocrisy: they both show respect to their doctors, yet both violate their prescriptions because they do not actually believe in the doctors' authority. Another affinity that connects these two men is that they stand out in the crowd of very uneducated peasants. The man from the tale is the previous doctor's "приятель" (115) and the man whom the Young Doctor treats makes such a good impression on the Young Doctor, that the latter feels about him: "Будто не посторонний мельник, а родной брат приехал ко мне погостить в больницу" (119). Both doctors separate these two men from other peasants. The Young Doctor writes with excitement to the nurse: "Вот вам исключение! Интеллигентный мельник!" (119). Bulgakov also connects them by making them both residents of the same village, Dultcevo, and emphasizes this place by the nurse's

sarcastic words: "Это Дульцево – знаменитое место!" (116). However, both peasants frustrate their doctors by showing disrespect to medicine and an aggressive self-confidence in the field of medical knowledge, which is, in fact, completely unknown to them.

Michail Glenny states that in this short story the "conflict between enlightenment and unreason" becomes "almost mythic" (9). I think that the presence of the double from the anecdote provides a metaphorical reading of the situation and turns a conflict between the Young Doctor and his patient into a conflict between two opposite forces – aggressive ignorance and the idealistic struggle for enlightenment – as Glenny notices. Although the incident with Fyodor Lipoy happened not long before the time that is described in "Black as Egypt Night," and he, presumably, is alive at the moment of the narrating an anecdote about him, his character went through an important transformation. He becomes a fictional character of the anecdote within the fictional world of the short story. The character in the tale suggests the global dimensions of the peasants' illiteracy, and the patient who suffers from malaria is a real-life illustration of this problem. Thus, Bulgakov creates a new meaning out of the relationship between a pair of doubles and brings the theme of ignorance into a larger perspective.

Significantly, Bulgakov does not provide a double for the woman in "The Speckled Rush" who really takes care of her health, profoundly believes in the power of medicine, and, to some extent, revolts against the common prejudice that doctors do more harm than good. The doctor in this story states his impression of her: "Она была единственным исключением: она боялась" (140). The absence of a double for an uneducated woman

who respects science, in a series of stories in which the doubling of characters is one of the major techniques, creates a deviation from the established pattern and suggests an additional meaning: "In a work of art deviations from the structural organization can be as meaningful as the realization of the latter" (Lotman 120). Thus, the story's single exception from otherwise total ignorance is manifested not only on the lexical level through the repetition of the words "она была одна," but on the structural level as well, and therefore reinforces the story's theme.

As we see, Bulgakov's use of device of the double in three short stories we examined transfers the theme of every story into a broader meaning and turns a particular incident into a manifestation of a universal theme.

The Device of the Double in the Frame-Story

In the previous chapter I explored the influence of the device of the double on the main themes of the short narratives by Bulgakov. In the present chapter I shall turn to the investigation of the influence of the device of the double on the structure of Bulgakov's two short stories "Morphine"("Морфий") (1927) and "I Killed"("Я убил") (1926). They are both frame-stories and the device of the double is explicitly used by Bulgakov in both of them. Although the themes of the stories are quite different, they have a similar effect which is the result of the similar structure and the use of doubles and counterparts.

The device of the frame-story is very old and stories of this type include such world-famous works The Thousand and One Nights (fourteenth century), Boccaccio's The Decameron (1350-53), Chaucer's Canterbury Tales (1380), and Marguerite de Navarre's The Heptameron (sixteenth century). The best known frame-stories in Russian literature are Pushkin's Повести Белкина, which he wrote in 1830. The cycle consists of five short stories and an editor's preface. Two narrators are present in the framing story: the late Ivan Petrovich Belkin who merely collected the stories, and the editor, one of the most ambiguous characters of Russian literature. He signs his preface "A.P." but he is not Pushkin "speaking in his own voice, but a mocking parody of a literary enterpreneur, whose affected erudition and bonhomie are unmasked by the crudity of his style and the absurdity of his unctuous moral pronouncements" (Moser 6). Due to the character of this narrator, the tales are taken by critics as parodies, although if we read them separately, without the framing story, they do not strike one as parodic. Thus,

already Pushkin used the figure of a narrator for contextualizing the main stories in a way that changes the perspective through which the main narrative is perceived.

The frame-story is characterized by the presence of the preliminary narrative within which one or more characters tell one or several stories which are the main stories or, as Gerald Prince puts it, "a narrative within narrative" (27). In my study, I will use the term "framing story" for the preliminary narrative, and the terms "inner story" or "main story" for the main narrative. The line between the framing narrative and the main narrative usually separates two different temporal and spatial locations. The main story mostly is a story from the past. A very important feature that distinguishes a frame-story from a regular one is a figure of a narrator in the framing story who is also a character. His ideology, that is, his attitude to the narrative, his system of belief, and his interaction with the other characters in the story play a crucial role in reader's perception of the story.

The creation of the framing narrative and the narrator of this narrative serves different purposes. Richard Shryock states that the framing stories "act to explain, to justify, to seduce, to revenge, to pass time" (4). For example, in the Russian *skaz,* which also can be considered a type of a frame-story, the narrator creates an illusion that he saw with his own eyes the events he is rendering which results in "a powerful effect of authenticity and sincerity, of truth-telling" (Lodge, The Art of Fiction, 18). Yet in Lermontov's novel Герой нашего времени one of the narrators plays the role of an indifferent and objective observer whose figure helps to unite short novels different in subject matter.

Seeing the frame-story from the position of Jakobson's theory of metaphoric-

metonymic poles, it is a purely artistic device which helps to create the connection between the inner story and world of the reader. This connection has a metonymical nature because it is one of the real connections between the objects. The connection between the inner story and the framing story can be metonymical and metaphorical at the same time. It depends on the relationship between the narrator and events of the framing story and the narrator and events of the inner story. If the narrator of the framing story plays only an informative role, as in the case with Lermontov's Герой нашего времени, he is usually connected with the inner story only metonymically because his relationship with the narrated story reflects an everyday situation of being a witness or participant in the event. If the narrator also plays a certain ideological role, the connection can be metaphorical. In such cases, as Richard Shryock points out, the attitude of the narrator of the framing story is in a dialectical relationship with the narrative of the inner story, and the greater the ideological difference displayed between an inner story and framing story, the more likely the framing story will play a fundamental role in creating the necessary background for the inner story.

One of the ways to provide a larger background for the inner story is to create a particular relationship between the narrator of the framing story and the narrator of the inner story. This way, even though the narrator of the framing story is absent during the course of the inner story, he will always be present, because the relationship is established in the very beginning of the text. In the two frame-stories of Bulgakov's "Morphine" and "I Killed," such a relationship is established by making the narrators of the framing stories the counterparts for the narrators of the inner stories. Thus, in the present chapter, I shall

investigate how such a relationship is established and how this relationship creates a context for the inner story. I also shall explore how this context influences the inner story and the overall effect of the work.

In the novella "Morphine," Bulgakov makes Doctor Bomgard, the narrator of the frame story, the counterpart for the protagonist, Doctor Polyakov, who narrates the inner story in a diary about his addiction to morphine. Doctor Bomgard is presented in the story as a character well-known to the reader from the cycle The Notes of the Young Doctor: "In 'Morphine' the hero of the previous stories goes to the town and describes the kind of culture shock he experiences when he returns to civilization. Then there is a shift to a story within the story, about a doctor who becomes addicted to morphine" (Proffer 94). Doctor Polyakov, a morphine-addict, has some common features with Doctor Bomgard: they are of the same age, graduated from the same university, and are sent to work in similar remote clinics. Bulgakov emphasizes all these common circumstances and goes even further: in the novella, Doctor Polyakov changes clinics and starts working at the same clinic where Doctor Bomgard previously worked. Hence, Bulgakov puts his hero in the same situation as Doctor Bomgard once was. It gives the reader an opportunity to compare the two doctors, their attitudes and behaviors.

The protagonist of "Morphine" is Doctor Polyakov who, in opposition to Doctor Bomgard, does not have any special interest in his medical practice and is preoccupied only with his personal tragedy: his mistress, a famous opera singer, has left him. Thus, the diary is an account of his everyday suffering from loneliness and addiction to morphine. Finally, he gives up the battle and shoots himself. Before committing suicide, Doctor

Polyakov gives his diary to Doctor Bomgard, and some time later, Bomgard decides to publish it.

Bulgakov presents Doctor Polyakov as a person living a double life. To everyone around him, he is a doctor, a professional who is responsible for the health of the peasants. To himself, he is a man being torn apart by his constant fight with his addiction and by his extreme changes in mood, and also a man who has had an affair with a married woman. Chekhov presents a similar situation in his short story "Lady with a Pet Dog"(1899). The protagonist, a married man who is an employee of a Moscow bank, falls in love with a married woman and they begin seeing each other secretly. This secret life becomes his "true" life and "society, the community, common life, are valued by the hero so far as they are able to sustain the true self in the secrecy it needs" (Miller 151). The hero escapes into his new life where he finds sincerity and honesty in spite of the dishonesty of the situation into which he and his beloved woman have fallen. Chekhov solely blames society for the situation's dishonesty and his characters' unhappiness. In contrast to the protagonist in Chekhov's story, Polyakov lives his external life in the world that demands honesty and even bravery, whereas his secret life is degrading. He has a chance to live the life of his counterpart, Doctor Bomgard, but does not desire to do so. His only desire is to forget his lover. From the very beginning of the story, Polyakov is condemned to addiction, and consequently, death, because he has nothing in his visible life that could save him to the same extent that Doctor Bomgard is saved by his passion for helping people.

In Bulgakov's story, Polyakov himself is responsible for his double life, and his hidden life is shameful. The form of the diary reveals his inner life to the reader, who can

only guess about his life among others and about how they actually perceive his behavior. Bulgakov compensates for this lack by using Doctor Bomgard, who is Polyakov's counterpart, to narrate a framing story and provide information about the kind of life that a country doctor is able to live.

The framing story of "Morphine" can be considered as a psychological sketch in terms of how this genre was earlier developed in Russian literature. In Повести Белкина, Pushkin initiated the use of the sketch as a form of short story and then Turgenev later developed this technique in his Записки охотника (1852): "Turgenev reformed the Russian short story on the basis of the genre of the lyric sketch" (Ninov 44). Furthermore, in Turgenev's work, " events . . . are narrated through the consciousness of the hunter, who comments explicitly or implicitly on the 'typical reality' he is observing – so that narrator and observer are here indeed one" (Moser 19). As a genre, the sketch does not allow a writer to develop the plot, but merely to depict reality through "the consciousness" of the narrator. The framing story in "Morphine" consists of a series of the narrator's statements about his new job and his life in the provincial town, for example, he notices: "Я был счастлив в 17-м году зимой, получив перевод в уездный город с глухого вьюжного участка" (149). These statements are subjective to the point that they are, in fact, statements of the narrator's feelings and comments about life in the small provincial town, and work in a large hospital in comparison with work in a small clinic.

In the very beginning of the novella, Bomgard gratefully recalls his life in a remote village: "А все-таки хорошо, что я пробыл на участке. . . Я стал отважным человеком. . . . Я не боюсь" (150). Bomgard's recollections remind the reader of the

previous stories in the series and provide the opportunity for a constant comparison between the lives of the two doctors. The description of how Polyakov spends his lonely evenings by pacing back and forth in his room thinking of his own sufferings, reminds the reader of the young doctor in previous stories who devoted such evenings to reading medical books up to the moment "пока не [начинали] слипаться отяжелевшие веки" (83). While Polyakov occupies himself in finding his next dose of morphine, the other doctor is rushing to a remote village to save a woman in labor.

The plot of the framing story does not include any significant events relating to the development of the character of Doctor Bomgard, but contributes, instead, to the plot of the story-diary and to the development of the character of Doctor Polyakov. In particular, the last event of the inner story, the death of Doctor Polyakov and his last wish to leave his diary to Bomgard, which is on the borderline of the inner story, is simultaneously the central event in the plot of the framing story. By using this event to connect the two plots, Bulgakov creates a causal, or metonymic, connection between them: dying Doctor Polyakov is brought to the hospital where Doctor Bomgard is working. It makes the transfer of the diary from Polyakov to Bomgard a logical act, and not a manifestation of *deus ex machina.*

Bulgakov also creates a more complex connection between the narrator of the framing story and the narrator of the inner story. This connection has a metaphoric nature which is based on the similarities and differences that exist between the two doctors and make them counterparts. Polyakov, lost in his battle with addiction, senses his similarities with Doctor Bomgard and, trying to escape from his illness, repeatedly alludes to

Bomgard in his diary: "Обращусь к Бомгарду. Почему именно к нему? Потому что он молод и товарищ по университету. . . . Помню его." (174). Doctor Bomgard experiences these same feelings for Doctor Polyakov: "Я не видел его, Сережку Полякова, два года, . . . Но помню его отлично " (153). Doctor Bomgard does not boldly describe his feelings for Doctor Polyakov, but uses the nickname "Сережка" instead of "Сергей" in order to underline his tender feelings for the friend of his youth. During his last moment, Doctor Polyakov calls Doctor Bomgard, and the latter answers: "Я здесь, – шепнул я, и голос мой прозвучал нежно у самых его губ" (155). Doctor Bomgard is surprised by his own unexpected tenderness, but the reader accepts their closeness because Bulgakov provides enough similarities between the two doctors to present them as counterparts. Their lives probably were similar when they were medical students, and their relationship was probably very important to them: in his last two letters to Bomgard, Polyakov addresses him as "милый" and asks for help "во имя [их] дружбы и университетских лет" (151).

For the Russian reader, these words have a very profound meaning. They indicate that young people, during their happy student years, have the noble ideal of serving others and their country. Many writers and poets have written about this kind of idealistic dream. For instance, Pushkin wrote a poem every year to celebrate the anniversary of the graduation of his class from the Lyceum. The words of one of these poems, "19 Октября" are well-known to the Russian reader. Pushkin writes about his classmates' loyalty to the ideals of their student years, which they spent in the Lyceum in Czarskoe Selo:

Куда бы нас ни бросила судьбина,

И счастие куда б ни повело,

Все те же мы: нам целый мир – чужбина.

Отечество нам – Царское Село (103).

In "Heart of a Dog," the words of Professor Preobrazhensky express the same idea: "Я – московский студент, а не Шариков!" (192). These words do not mean that Professor Preobrazhensky is still a student. This expression means that he is still faithful to those ideas that Moscow students share. Thus, by referring to the university years of both protagonists, Bulgakov creates a "previous stage" in their lives and careers in order to underline the differences that come later. One of the doctors makes real his dream of serving people, and the other one dies ridiculously because he rejects the ideals of his youth.

The presentation of the two doctors as counterparts allows Bulgakov to create not only a monologue through Polyakov's diary, but also a hidden dialogue with his counterpart, Doctor Bomgard. This dialogue is extremely polemical because Polyakov strives to prove to someone that his life is normal and that he is doing nothing wrong to the people around him. He convinces himself: "Я великолепно справляюсь с операциями, я безукоризненно внимателен к рецептуре и ручаюсь моим врачебным словом, что мой морфинизм вреда моим пациентам не причинил" (164). Who is this "someone"? The reader can presume that for Polyakov it is that ideal doctor whom they dreamt and talked about during their happy university years. However, for the reader, this "someone" is Polyakov's counterpart, Doctor

Bomgard, who is doing everything possible to be a good doctor.

In the cycle Notes of a Young Doctor, the protagonist is simply referred to as the Young Doctor; he possesses the name Doctor Bomgard only in "Morphine." Polyakov's diary encourages the reader to recall the Young Doctor's (or Bomgard's) words about the same subject. Doctor Polyakov seldom refers to his job, and when he does, it takes the form of short sentences. For instance, he states, "Работаю механически. С работой я свыкся. Сегодня в первый раз делал операцию поворота" (157). In contrast to these short notes, the whole cycle of Notes of a Young Doctor is devoted to the Young Doctor's job, his medical cases, relationships with patients, and philosophical musings about a medical doctor's duties. Thus, the relationship between the Young Doctor's words and those of Polyakov is like that described by Bakhtin: "Оно [слово] направлено на обычный предмет, называя его, изображая, выражая, и лишь косвенно ударяет по чужому слову, сталкиваясь с ним как бы в самом предмете" (227). Polyakov does not openly argue with anyone, but presumes to know the argument that would come from a devoted doctor. The use of the counterpart makes clear what the argument against Polyakov would be. The reader finds this argument in the text of Notes of a Young Doctor, which is narrated by Polyakov's counterpart, Doctor Bomgard.

The form of the diary is conventionally regarded as a confession, and Richard Shryock states that a confession is an act that "respects" authority by not trying to reason. I believe that Polyakov's confession is full of respect to an invisible authority, and this authority is the ideal doctor. For the reader, Doctor Bomgard is the one who comes close

to this ideal doctor. Thus, the framing story provides an opportunity to see this real doctor; that is, it provides a context for the inner story by which it should be perceived.

Another work by Bulgakov, the novella "I Killed," is a frame-story narrated by two narrators. The framing story is narrated in the first-person point of view by a doctor whose main function is to introduce the reader to the protagonist, his colleague Doctor Jashvin. The narrator describes Jashvin's appearance, his skills as a doctor, his interests (reading and theater), and some character traits: "Молчаливый и . . . очень скрытный" (648). Hence, by the time that Doctor Jashvin becomes a narrator, the reader has a relatively complete portrait of him.

Doctor Jashvin tells the inner story about his horrible experiences during the Civil War when he was mobilized into the Petlura Army and was witness to torture and murderer. He has to treat a colonel of the Petlura Army, but during the treatment, Doctor Jashvin shoots the colonel as he cannot accept how the colonel tortured his prisoners. After the murder he miraculously escapes.

Killing during war is a part of warfare, indeed, an unavoidable consequence. Thus, telling a story about soldiers killing during the war cannot bring a new perspective to the story. However, Bulgakov does introduce a new perspective by making the killer a doctor. Moreover, the author formulates the main purpose of the medical profession through the voice of the first narrator, who introduces the reader to Doctor Yashvin: "Убийство не свойственно нашей профессии" (649). Thus, the ideology of the first narrator is formulated in the framing story and greatly contrasts with the action of the protagonist of the inner story. However, ideology is in contrast with the action, not with the ideology of

the killer. Interestingly, the reader has no doubt concerning Doctor Jashvin's high moral standards. This assurance comes first of all from the situation in which the Doctor Jashvin acted as a killer: he killed a torturer and executioner, not an innocent man. However, this assurance also comes from the established relationship between the narrator of the frame story and the protagonist-narrator of the inner story, that is, the relationship of the counterparts.

The first narrator is Doctor's Jashvin's secret admirer, as the first narrator has only praise for him. Yashvin is handsome and is dressed in good taste: "замечательный рассказчик," "успевающий читать," and "врач . . . очень хороший" (648). As a result of the first narrator's admiration for Jashvin, the reader perceives him positively, and his act of killing becomes a horrifying personal tragedy.

By showing the killing through the personal tragedy of the protagonist, Bulgakov creates a new perspective on the horror of war in order to achieve an effect of defamiliarization. Shklovsky states that "the habitualization devours works, clothes, furniture, one's wife, and the fear of war" (20). Thus, the belief that killing during war is a natural event loses its habitual meaning and becomes frightening as a result of its unexpected context and the killer's ideals.

However, the position of a secret admirer also creates a problem of extreme subjectivity. The statements made by the narrator of the framing story in "I Killed," would be congruent and objective if made by a third-person omniscient narrator with an "Olympian," or considerably distant, perspective. However, if they are made by a character-narrator of the story, the protagonist's humane qualities become less credible

because of the first's narrator's obvious sympathy for him. Consequently, the narrator is at risk of becoming an unreliable narrator, that is "one whose rendering of the story and/or commentary on it the reader has reasons to suspect" (Rimmon-Kenan 100). Bulgakov uses two elements in order to decrease the subjectivity of the narrator of the frame-story. First, he makes the narrator and Doctor Jashvin mere colleagues, not friends. Hence, the narrator's admiration for Jashvin is expressed from some distance, which reduces extreme subjectivity. Second, Bulgakov creates not only the narrator who characterizes the protagonist, but also a narratee for Jashvin's story, a group of doctors who were the narrator's guests: "Нас было пять человек [ординаторов] в комнате" (648). Thus, the setting of the story includes an audience that rejects an intimate and, consequently, subjective hearing of Jashvin's confession.

By giving Jashvin's narration a group of narratees, Bulgakov creates a very strong level of the norms of the text "in accordance with which the events and characters of the story are evaluated" (Uspensky, qtd. in Rimmon-Kenan 81). The credo of the medical profession is formulated by not only the narrator, but also by a group of doctors. They agree that the main intention of any doctor is to save people and not to harm them. Hence, the group of doctors becomes a means of expressing the norms that the protagonist breaks.

Rimmon-Kenan agrees with Uspensky that "the ideology of the narrator-focalizer is usually taken as authoritative"(81). In "I Killed," this ideology is formulated by the narrator-focalizer of the framing story, and is strengthened by the presence of several narratees and the fact that they are doctors. Thus, the function of the framing story in this

instance is not only to characterize the protagonist of the inner story, but also to establish a moral criterion for the act that he committed in the past. In this established context, the main story becomes not a story about killing during war, but about the doctor who killed his patient.

In accordance with their professional occupation, the narrator of the framing story, together with the three doctors, and the Doctor Jashvin can be considered functional doubles. Thus, Bulgakov uses the device of functional doubles in order to manifest an authoritative point of view; that is, of the essentially humanistic nature of the medical profession.

The reader perceives Jashvin's story differently after learning the opinion of four other doctors who articulate the attitude that every doctor should possess toward patients. Reading Jashvin's account of his adventure during the Civil War, we always remember that he first saw the colonel as a patient, and only secondly as a person. Only by realizing Jashvin's perception of the colonel can we understand the intensity of Jashvin's hatred for this torturer. This understanding becomes possible after recognizing the connections between the protagonist, the narrator of the framing story and the narratees, that is, the connection based on similarity and contrast.

The metaphorical nature of the device of the double is evident through the discourse of the story. While the inner story develops in accordance with a metonymical process where events happen in chronological order, the presence of the functional doubles in the framing story controls the development of the theme by the process of similarity and contrast; that is, by a metaphorical process. Every event that Doctor Jashvin

describes, and every action he takes, is seen through the eyes of the group of doctors with whom Jashvin shares the same profession. The protagonist is connected with them by the principle of similarity, but he is also in contrast with them because he broke the credo of the medical profession.

If the text consisted of Jashvin's story only, the subject matter simply would be a killing that took place during the war, and the story would celebrate a brave man who dared to right a wrong. However, the presence of the protagonist's doubles in the framing story establishes a context which provides a ground for exploring the inhuman nature of war which turns the doctor, who was initially a savior, into a murderer.

As we see, in Bulgakov's two frame-stories the device of the double is used for creating a particular relationship between the narrators of the framing stories and the narrators of the inner stories. These relationships are between counterparts that share only one, or a few, similar traits, and similar situations in which they find themselves. This common scheme produces a similar effect in both stories despite the differences between them. This effect is one of the changes that the framing story produces in the inner story by creating the context for the latter.

Conclusion

The objective of this thesis was to examine the implications of the device of the double in the short narratives by Mikhail Bulgakov. Although the phenomenon of the double in literature is very common, the methods which the critics use to explain its implications are not clearly defined. Their analyses, more often than not, fuse the critical perspective with the psychological. Hence, in this study, an attempt was made to investigate the implications of the device of the double exclusively as a formal device. In conjunction with this precise implication, there was an attempt to clarify the terminology that is used in scholarship for analyzing the double in literary fiction. Two groups of terms were identified which define two different types of double, one under the main term "*doppelgänger*" and the other one under the term "counterpart."

Traditionally, the device of the double is viewed by authors and critics as a means of characterization, and this study showed that Bulgakov continues this tradition. He creates counterparts who repeat every single character trait of the original characters, as well as that type of counterpart who functions to highlight only one particular feature of the original. Such repetition of character traits increases the amount of information about the hero and helps the reader to construct a whole image of the character.

However, other elements of a work can be influenced by the device of the double, and it was one of the main interests of the author of this study to find those interactions between the device of the double and other elements of the work. Thus, the point of view in Bulgakov's novella "Heart of a Dog"("Собачье сердце") was examined in order to

find out how the biological doubles are portrayed. Through this perspective, it was discovered that giving to one character a right to narrate, while rejecting this right for his double, gives a very strong impression of the latter's enigmatic and uncanny nature.

The device of the double is used more frequently in short narratives than in novels. This fact led to posing a question as to the reason for such frequency. One of the reasons is that the double creates another level of reality in the work and helps to enlarge the fictive world of a short narrative without the expansion of the text. This level establishes a context for the events that happen in the story, and connects those events with the concrete historical and cultural moment. This, as we saw, occurs in the novella "Heart of a Dog" and the short story "Fire of the Khans" ("Ханский огонь").

The main theme of the work also can be influenced by the device of the double. The very existence of a double provides material for turning the basic theme of a work into one of a universal nature. Thus, in the novella "Diaboliada" ("Дьяволиада"), and the short stories "Red Crown"("Красная корона") and "Dark as Egypt Night" ("Тьма египетская"), the double highlights the global dimension of the theme of the work.

The device of the double works as a structural device for creating a frame-story. Through the examination of two of Bulgakov's frame-stories, "Morphine"("Морфий") and "I killed" ("Я убил"), it was found that should the narrator of the framing story become a counterpart for the main character of the inner story, the connection between the two exists during the course of the inner story even when the first narrator is absent. This connection provides an orientation for a reader which influences a reader's perception of the events and characters in the inner story.

In this study, Bulgakov's short narratives alone provided the material for exploring the implication of the device of the double. As we saw, the device of the double has several, often related, functions within the narrative economy of his short fiction. This device, however, also occurs in his novel The Master and Margarita. Thus, the conclusions reached in this study open the possibility for further investigation into the implications of the device of the double.

Works Cited

Arnason, H. Harvard. History of Modern Art. New York: Prentice Hall, 1998.

Bal, Mieke. Narratology. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1985.

Бахтин, Михаил. Проблемы поэтики Достоевского. Москва: "Советская Россия,"1974.

Bravo, Nicole. "Doubles and Counterparts." Companion to Literary Myths, Heroes and Archetypes. Ed. P. Brunel. New York: Routledge, 1992. 343-382.

Булгаков, Михаил, "Александр Пушкин." Собрание сочинений в пяти томах. Т.3. Москва: "Худ. литература," 1989. 463-511.

---. Дневник. Письма. 1914 –1940. Сост. В. И. Лосев. Москва: "Современный писатель," 1997.

---. "Дьяволиада." Собрание сочинений в пяти томах. Т.2. Москва: "Худ. литература," 1989. 7-44.

---. "Записки юного врача." Собрание сочинений в пяти томах. Т.1.Москва: "Худ. литература," 1989. 71-146.

---. "Красная корона." Собрание сочинений в пяти томах. Т. 1. Москва: "Худ. литература," 1989. 443-448.

---. "Морфий." Собрание сочинений в пяти томах. Т.1. Москва: "Худ. литература," 1989. 147-178.

---. "Собачье сердце." Собрание сочинений в пяти томах. Т. 2. Москва: "Худ. литература," 1989. 119-210.

---. "Ханский огонь." Собрание сочинений в пяти томах. Т. 1.Москва: "Худ. литература," 1989. 383-398.

---. "Я убил". Собрание сочинений в пяти томах. Т. 1.Москва: "Худ. литература," 1989. 647-657.

Bulgakov, Mikhail. The Master and Margarita. Trans. R. Pevear and L. Volokhonsky. London: Penguin Books, 1997.

Chamisso, Adelbert von. The Marvellous History of the Shadowless Man. London: Holden and Hardingham, 1913.

Chatman, Seymour. Story and Discourse. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1980.

Чехов А. П."Вишневый сад". Полное собрание сочинений и писем в восьми томах. Т.7, Москва: Издательство "Правда," 1970. 317-370.

---. "Дама с собачкой." Полное собрание сочинений и писем в восьми томах. Т.6, Москва: Издательство "Правда," 1970. 364-380.

---. "Черный монах." Полное собрание сочинений и писем в восьми томах. Т.5, Москва: Издательство "Правда,"1970.261-292.

Chizhevsky, Dmitri. "The Theme of Double in Dostoevsky." Dostoevsky. A Collection of Critical Essays. Ed. Rene Wellek. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.,1962.

Chudakov, A. P. Chekhov's Poetics. Trans. E. Cruise and D. Dragt. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1983.

Чудакова, Мариетта. Жизнеописание Михаила Булгакова. Москва: "Книга," 1988.

Coats, Paul. The Double and the Other. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1988.

Conrad, Joseph. "The Secret Sharer." Stories of the Double. Ed. Albert J. Guerard. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1967. 15-56.

Dante Alighieri. The Divine Comedy. Trans. A. Mandelbaum. The Norton Anthology of World Masterpieces. Ed. S. Lawall. New York: Norton and Company, 1999. 1293 -1428.

Достоевский, Ф. "Бесы." Полное собрание сочинений. Т.6. Ленинград: "Наука,"1990.

---. "Братья Карамазовы." Полное собрание сочинений. Т.13. Ленинград: "Наука,"1990.

---. "Преступление и наказание."Полное собрание сочинений. Т.7. Ленинград: "Наука," 1990.

Dostoevsky, Fyodor. "The Double." Stories of the Double. Ed. Albert J. Guerard. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1967. 57-210.

Driessen, F. C. Gogol as a Short-Story Writer. Paris: Mouton and Co., 1965.

Ericson, Edward E. The Apocalyptic Vision of Mikhail Bulgakov's "The Master and Margarita." New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1991.

Frank, Joseph. Dostoevsky: the Seeds of Revolt 1821 – 1849. London, 1977.

Gilgamesh. Trans. N. K. Sandars. The Norton Anthology of World Masterpieces. Ed. Sarah Lawall. New York: Norton and Company, 1999.16-46.

Glenny, Michael. Introduction. A Country Doctor's Notebook. By Mikhail Bulgakov. London Collins, 1975.

Гоголь, Николай. "Нос." Повести. Нью-Йорк: Издательство имени Чехова, 1952. 67 – 96.

– – – . "Шинель." Повести. Нью-Йорк: Издательство имениЧехова,1952. 161-196.

Gordon, Paul. The Critical Double. Tuscaloosa and London: U of Alabama P, 1995.

Goscilo, Helen "Point of View in Bulgakov's 'Heart of a Dog.'" Slavic and East European Journal 3 (1976): 32-45.

Guerard, Albert J. "Concepts of the Double." Stories of the Double. Ed. Albert J. Guerard. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1967. 1-14.

Herdman, John. The Double in Nineteenth-Century Fiction. Houndmills: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1990.

Hoffmann, E. T. A. "Automata." The Best Tales of Hoffmann. New York: Dover Publications,1967. 71-103.

Jakobson, Roman. "The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles." Modern Criticism and Theory. Ed. David Lodge. New York: Longman, 1996. 57-61.

Кедров, Константин. "Вкус к литературе у московской молодежи по-прежнему есть." Известия 9 сент. 1993: 3.

Keppler, Carl F. The Literature of the Second Self. Tucson, Arizona: The U of Arizona P, 1972.

Krugovoy, George. The Gnostic Novel of Mikhail Bulgakov: Sources and Exegesis. Lanham: UP of America, 1991.

Левкиевская Е. Е. "Двоедушники." Славянские древности:

Этнолингвистический словарь. Москва, 1999.

Leibowitz, Judith. Narrative Purpose in the Novella. Paris: Mouton, 1974.

Лермонтов, М. Ю. "Герой нашего времени." Избранные произведения в двух томах. Т. 2. Москва: "Правда," 1978. 361-492.

Lodge, David. The Art of Fiction. London: Penguin Books, 1992.

---. The Modes of Modern Writing. Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP, 1977.

Lotman, Yury. Analysis of the Poetic Text. Trans. D. Barton Johnson. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1976.

Martin, Wallace. Recent Theories of Narrative. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press,1986.

Matthews, Brander. "The Philosophy of the Short Story." Short Story Theories. Ed. Charles E. May. Ohio UP, 1976. 52-59.

Miller, Karl. Doubles. Studies in Literary History. London: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Milne, Lesley. Mikhail Bulgakov. A Critical Biography. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Moser, Charles A., ed. The Russian Short Story. Boston: Twayne Publisher, 1986.

Нинов, А. А. Современный рассказ: из наблюдений над русской прозой. Ленинград: "Худ. литература," 1969.

Passage, Charles E. The Russian Hoffmannists. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1963.

Prince, Gerald. A Grammar of Stories. Paris: Mouton, 1973.

Poe, Edgar Allan. "Review of Twice-Told Tales." Short Story Theories. Ed. Charles E. May. Ohio UP, 1976. 45-51.

---. "William Wilson." The Complete Poems and Stories. V. 1. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951. 277-292.

Proffer, Ellendea. Bulgakov. Life and Work. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1984.

Пушкин, А. С. "Евгений Онегин." Собрание сочинений в десяти томах. Т. 4. Москва: "Худ. литература," 1959.

---. "Капитанская дочка." Собрание сочинений в десяти томах. Т .5. Москва: "Худ. литература," 1959. 286-411.

---. "Повести Белкина." Собрание сочинений в десяти томах. Т. 5. Москва: "Худ. литература," 1959. 49-119.

---. "19 Октября."Собрание сочинений в десяти томах. Т.2. Москва: "Худ. литература," 1959.102-106.

Rank, Otto. The Double: a Psychoanalytical Study. Trans. H. Tucker. London: Karnac, 1989.

Reber, Atther S. The Penguin Dictionary of Psychology. New York: Viking Penguin Inc., 1985.

Reed, Walter L. Meditations on the Hero. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1978.

Richter, Jean Paul Friedrich. Sienbenkas. 1796 – 7. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam, 1983.

Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics. New York: Methuen, 1983.

Rohrberger, Mary. "The Short Story: A Proposed Definition."Short Story Theories. Ed. Charles E. May. Ohio UP, 1976. 80-82.

Rogers, Robert. The Double in Literature. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1970.

Rosenfield, Claire. "The Shadow Within: The Conscious and Unconscious Use of the Double." Stories of the Double. Ed. Albert J. Guerard. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1967. 311-331.

Schumm, Sandra J. Reflection in Sequence. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1999.

Shakespeare, William. The Comedy of Errors. Ed. T. S. Dorsch. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge UP, 1988.

---. Twelfth Night. Ed. J. C. Dent. Oxford: Claredon, 1938.

Shklovsky, Victor. "Art as Technique." Modern Criticism and Theory. Ed. D. Lodge. New York: Longman:1999. 15-30.

Shryock, Richard. Tales of Storytelling. Embedded Narrative in Modern French Fiction. New York: Peter Lang, 1993.

Сказки. Библиотека русского фольклора. Том 2. Москва, "Советская Россия," 1989.

Собачье сердце. Режиссер В. Бортко. Автор сценария Н. Бортко. В ролях: Е. Евстигнеев, В. Толоконников, Б. Плотников, Р. Карцев. Ленфильм, 1988.

Stanzel, F. K. A Theory of Narrative. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. "The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde." Stories of the Double. Ed. Albert J. Guerard. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1967.

Thrall, William Flint, and Hibbard, Addison. A Handbook to Literature. New York: The Odyssey Press, 1960.

Tymms, Ralph. Doubles in Literary Psychology. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1949.

Тургенев, И. С. "Дворянское гнездо" Собрание сочинений в десяти томах. Т.2. Москва: "Гос. издательство худ. литературы," 1953. 107-320.

---. "Дым." Собрание сочинений в десяти томах. Т. 4. Москва: "Гос. издательство худ. литературы," 1953. 7-146.

---. "Записки охотника." Собрание сочинений в десяти томах. Т.1. Москва: "Гос. издательство худ. литературы," 1953.

---. "Рудин." Собрание сочинений в десяти томах. Т.2. Москва: "Гос. издательство худ. литературы," 1953. 7-106.

Тынянов, Ю.Н. Поэтика. История литературы. Кино. Москва, 1977.

Успенский, Б. А. Поэтика композиции. Москва: "Искусство," 1970.

Virgil. The Aeneid. Trans. Robert Fitzgerald. New York: Random House, 1983.

Wilde, Oscar. "The Picture of Dorian Gray." Complete Works of Oscar Wilde. London and Glasgow: Collins, 1967. 17-167.

Wright, Colin A. Mikhail Bulgakov: Life and Interpretations. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1978.

Zholkovsky, Alexander. Themes and Texts. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1984.

Works Consulted

Белобровцева, Ирина. Роман Михаила Булгакова "Мастер и Маргарита": конструктивные принципы организации текста. Тарту: Kirjastus, 1997.

Boland, John. Short Story Technique. Sussex: Forest House Books, 1973.

Brooks, Peter. Reading for the Plot. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984.

Burgin, Diana L. "Bulgakov's Early Tragedy of the Scientist-Creator: An Interpretation of 'Heart of a Dog.'" SEEJ 22 (1978): 494-508.

Culler, Jonathan. Structuralist Poetics. London: Routledge and Kegan, 1975.

Ejxenbaum, B. M. O'Henry and the Theory of the Short Story. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1968.

Фуссо, Сюзанна. "'Собачье сердце' – неуспех превращения." Литературное обозрение 5 (1991): 29 – 34.

Gross, Ethan Allen. The Short Story. Chicago: A.C. McCJURG & CO., 1914.

Holquist, Michael. Dostoevsky and the Novel. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1977.

Якобсон, Роман. "Заметки о прозе поэта Пастернака." Работы по поэтике. Москва: Прогресс, 1987. 324-338.

Leutch, Thomas M. What Stories Are: Narrative Theory and Interpretation. London: The Pennsylvania State UP, 1986.

Luker N. ed. The Short Story in Russia. Nottingham, England: Astra Press, 1991.

Margolin, Uri. "Singular, Splits, Multiples: the Theme of the Double and Fictional Worlds Semantics." Journal of Literary Semantics" 21.3 (1992): 175-203.

Morson, Gary Saul. Hidden in Plain View. California: Stanford UP, 1987.

Nelles, William. Frameworks: Narrative Levels and Embedded Narrative. New York: P. Lang, 1997.

Osterwalder, Hans. T.S. Eliot: Between Metaphor and Metonymy. Zurich: Francke Verlag Bern, 1978.

O'Toole, L. Michael. Structure, Style and Interpretation in the Russian Short Story. New Haven: Yale UP, 1982.

Paine, J. H. E. Theory and Criticism of the Novella. Bonn: Bouvier, 1979.

Scheglov, Y. K., and A. K. Zholkovskii. Generating the Literary Text: Russian Poetics in Translation. No.1. L. M. O'Toole and A. Shukman, 1975.

Scholes, Robert and Robert Kellogg. The Nature of Narrative. New York: Oxford UP, 1966.

Смирнов, И.П. "Логико-семантические особенности коротких нарративов." Russian Short Story. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1984. 47-64.

Snyder, John. Prospects of Power. The UP of Kentucky, 1991.

Thody, Philip. Twentieth-Century Literature: Critical Issues and Themes. New York: St.Martin's Press, 1996.

Waldeck, Peter B. The Split Self from Goethe to Broch. Lewiburg: Bucknell UP, 1979.

Webber, Andrew J. The Doppelgänger. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996

Wilson, Raymond J. "Ricoeur's 'Allegory' and Jakobson's Metaphoric/Metonymic Principles." Allegory Revisited. Ed. Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka. Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994. 293-302.

Зеркалов, А. Евангелие Михаила Булгакова. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1984.